National Library
of Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

59

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

TC –

0-315-26792-5

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur

GLENDA PATRICIA SIMMS

Date of Birth – Date de naissance

25.1.39

Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien

☑ Yes / Oui ☐ No / Non

Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance

JAMAICA W.I

Permanent Address – Résidence fixe

3606 21st AVE.
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN
S4S0V2

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse

POLITICAL MESSIANISM: THE CASE OF MICHAEL MANLEY.

Degree for which thesis was presented
Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

PH.D

Year this degree conferred
Année d'obtention de ce grade

1985

University – Université

UNIVERSITY of ALBERTA

Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse

DR. BRUCE BAIN

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature

Glenda Simms

Date

18/4/85

NL-91 (r. 84/03)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

POLITICAL MESSIANISM: THE CASE OF MICHAEL MANLEY

by

© GLENDA PATRICIA SIMMS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: GLENDA PATRICIA SIMMS

TITLE OF THESIS: POLITICAL MESSIANISM: THE CASE OF MICHAEL MANLEY

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Glenda

PERMANENT ADDRESS: 3606 - 21st Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0V2

Dated 19th April 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled

POLITICAL MESSIANISM: THE CASE OF MICHAEL MANLEY

submitted by

GLENDA PATRICIA SIMMS

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Educational Psychology

Supervisor

J G Paterson

J Mitchell

External Examiner

Date April 22, 1985

DEDICATION

THIS THESIS IS DEDICATED TO THE STRUGGLES
OF THE JAMAICAN FOLK

ABSTRACT

This is a study of the phenomenon of political messianism as it was demonstrated in Jamaica under the Prime Ministership of Michael Manley (1972-1980).

Michael Manley, the fifty-nine year old son of Norman and Edna Manley, lead his country with flamboyance and energy through some of its most significant social and political changes. This he was able to do through a combination of historical factors, personal style and a life experience of service to the National Worker's Union, the People's National Party and to the poor masses of his society.

In his political development Michael Manley became the "Joshua" of the Jamaican people who have historically sought redemption through messianic leaders and millenarian movements. In this role as "Joshua" Michael Manley managed to raise the political consciousness of his society. In the process he alienated the middle and upper classes and frustrated the poor. Nevertheless he has continued to conjure up images of redemption through his passionate commitment to justice, fair play and freedom from oppression.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the end product of a long process of soul searching, agonizing and enduring. This thesis is a product of LOVE.

For their caring, understanding and constant support, I wish to acknowledge the following friends:

Dr. Paula Anderson (Jamaica)
Dr. Patricia Anderson (Jamaica)
Jo Milne-Holme (Edmonton)
Jestina Blake-Hill (Regina)
Michael Millington (Regina)
Anne Nield (Edmonton)
Joan Tully (Edmonton)
Leonard Black and Family (Edmonton)
Dr. Lorne Brown (Regina)

These are few of the real friends who assisted me in a variety of ways, as I worked to achieve my goal.

To them, and to many others whom I have not named, I will be forever grateful for their assistance during the fall of 1983. I wish to acknowledge:

The staff of the Institute of Social and Economic Research (University of the West Indies, Jamaica),
Faculty members of the Department of Social Sciences (UWI),
Staff members of the People's National Party Headquarters (Kingston, Jamaica),
All the persons who allowed me to interview them for this study.

For their patience, tolerance and unconditional love, I wish to thank my family:

My cousins Terry and Fay Senior who allowed me to share their home in Kingston in 1983.

My brothers Barrington, Michael and Maurice who always assisted in every way.

My sisters Pauline, Elma, Carmen and Maureen who were always there.

My nieces and nephews who always cheer for "Auntie Peggy".

For their effort, intellectual stimulation and guidance, I acknowledge my thesis committee:

Dr. John Patterson (Educational Psychology)
Dr. John Mitchell (Educational Psychology)
Dr. Paul Saram (Sociology)
Dr. Kazim Baachus (Educational Foundations)

For his patience and constant support I will be forever grateful to my advisor Dr. Bruce Bain.

For his insights, intellectual rigor, and commitment to Caribbean scholorship, I acknowledge my indebtedness to my external examiner, Professor Rex Nettleford of the University of the West Indies (Kingston, Jamaica).

For her patience and professionalism I will be forever grateful to Fran Schuster of Telsec Business Centres (Regina) Ltd.

Lastly, I acknowledge the dreams of my mother, Myrtle Thompson and the love and sacrifice of my children Michelle, Alf and Shaun Simms.

For all of us - THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE PROBLEM 1
- Introduction 1
- The Nature of the Problem 2
- Significance of the Study 5
- Limitations and Specific Restrictions of the Study 5
- Plan and Overview of the Study 7
- Definition of Terms 9

II. LITERATURE REVIEW 13
- Introduction 13
- The Political Personality 13
- National Character 17
- Charismatic Leadership: The Influence of Religion on Political Behavior 20
- Charisma as a Distinguishing Quality of the Messianic Type 22
- Politics and Religion: A Base for Charisma 25
- Religious Responses to Political Action: Messianic Cults and Millenarian Movements 30
- Summary 36

III. METHODOLOGY 37
- Introduction 37
- Method Used in the Study 42
- Source I 42
- Source II 43
- Source III 44
- Interviewees 44
- Interview Procedure 47

IV. THE GENESIS OF CHARISMA: MICHAEL MANLEY'S MEANINGS TO THE JAMAICAN SOCIETY 50
- Introduction 50
- The Family Line: The Legacy of the Free Coloureds of Jamaica 51
- Powerful Mothers 62
- An Illustrious Father 72
- The Father's Legacy of Ideas 75
- A Charismatic Cousin 76
- The Search for Redemption 81
- The Rastafarian Legacy 88
- Summary 91
- Joshua in Babylon: An Analysis of Image Making in Jamaica 92
- A Joshua for the People 96
- The Opposition Responds to the Image 99

CHAPTER PAGE

V. FAMILY PERSPECTIVE: A LOOK AT THE LEADER FROM THE INSIDE 106
Introduction 106
The Personal Attributes of Michael Manley's Charismatic Appeal 108
A Mother's Influence 113
The Limits of Charisma 122
Part Supporters Look at Joshua 126
The Strenghts of a Charismatic Leader 128
The Leader is not Infallible: Supporters' Assessment of Michael Manley's Shortcomings 131
The Dynamics Within the PNP 136
The Contradictions of Class and Caste: The Meanings of Race in Jamaican Society 140
Michael Manley: How his Political Opponents See Him 145
An Attempt to Reinterpret the Values: The Question of Class Betrayal 150
The Politics of Change 152

VI. MICHAEL MANLEY SPEAKS OF HIMSELF 158
Introduction 158
The Interview 159

VII. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES 185
Introduction 185
The 45th Annual PNP Conference (September 21-25, 1983) 186
Findings From The Interviews 192
Michael Manley's Contributions To Jamaican Society 195
Contradictions 197
Consistency of Belief System 202
A Mother's Insluence 202
Charisma: Some Thoughts and Definitions 203
Conclusions and Implications 210

BIBLIOGRAPHY 214

APPENDIX 1 227
A. SUPPORTERS OF THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY 228
PARTY SUPPORTER AND FORMER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY 229
CONVERSATION WITH A CLERGYMAN - A SUPPORTER OF MICHAEL MANLEY AND HIS POLICIES 249
FORMER DIPLOMAT - MEMBER OF THE PNP AND A STRONG SUPPORTER OF MICHAEL MANLEY AND HIS POLICIES . . . 252
TECHNOCRAT AND PARTY SUPPORTER 256
ECONOMIST AND FORMER PNP SUPPORTER 267

CHAPTER PAGE

TRADE UNIONIST 283
POLITICAL SCIENTIST 293
YOUTH LEADER 305

B. OPPONENTS OF THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY 314
MINISTER OF GOVERNMENT (JLP) 315
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT:JLP 333
NEWSPAPER EDITOR: JOURNALIST AND OPPONENT OF THE PNP 344
THE LEADER OF ANOTHER POLITICAL PARTY 347

C. MANLEY FAMILY MEMBERS 362
FAMILY MEMBER A 363
FAMILY MEMBER B 386

APPENDIX 11 396
SONGS AND HYMNS OF THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY 397

APPENDIX 111 400
A PHOTOGRAPHIC ACCOUNT 401
A FAMILY DYNASTY 402
WITH THE CROWDS 408
THE INTERNATIONAL APPEAL 413

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The concern of this study is with the phenomenon of political messianism exemplified by Michael Manley, former Prime Minister of Jamaica. This concept seemed important to understand the relationship between the leaders and those who follow in Jamaican politics. The decision to use it was also influenced by a 1976 CBC report showing Michael Manley campaigning amongst the rural Jamaican folk. This captured a scene which depicted Jamaicans dancing to the contagious beat of reggae music while they shouted "Joshua, Joshua." What subsequently remained was the image of a crowd rhythmically swaying in one direction while Michael Manley swayed in the opposite direction. This wild adoration of someone who was either missing the beat or listening to his own drummer, in Thoreau's terms, strengthened the desire to investigate the messianic leadership role played by Manley.

Michael Manley was selected as the subject of this study because during his term as Prime Minister of Jamaica, he influenced not only the majority of Jamaicans, but has been described as a "highly acclaimed Third World and Commonwealth leader and among the most eloquent advocate of a new economic order" (Doyle, 1976, p. 49). But besides his impact on the international community, Michael Manley succeeded in lifting the revolutionary zeal of his people to unprecedented heights. In this process, he sharpened the awareness of Jamaicans to the inconsistencies within their society.

Manley's opponents, critics and detractors have described him as a muddler and a marionette (Arawak, 1980). However, his attempts at the social and economic reconstruction of Jamaican society can be seen as his mission or spiritual duty in a conceptual framework of messianic action. Such a framework is consistent with Jamaica's socio-political development and with the recurrence of the messianic themes which peaked, especially between 1938 and 1962, when the personalities of Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante dominated the political climate (Nettleford, 1971).

By adapting and applying the psycho-social concept of messianism in an effort to understand Michael Manley as a leader and then, by further linking messianic leadership to the socio-cultural and economic realities of particular societies, one can potentially contribute to an ever-increasing grasp of how messianic leadership emerges. Many academics stress the need for a systematically developed body of literature that highlights the interaction between individuals, society and politics (Aronoff, 1967; Browning, 1968; De Renzo, 1974; Edinger, 1965; George, 1968; Knutson, 1973; Greenstein, 1975; Herman, 1977; Isaak, 1975; Lasswell, 1968). Amongst these writers, the general consensus is that political action must be viewed as human behavior which results from the interplay of the socio-cultural environment with individual psychological predispositions and perceptions.

The Nature of the Problem

The concept of "charisma" is used in this study to give a focus to the nature of messianic leadership. The use of this concept as a descriptor of a style of behavior in a particular context must address both definitional problems as well as the adequacy and applicability of the concept to the analysis of a rational-legal politican.

The concept of charisma as formulated by Weber (1947) and refined by scholars such as Tucker (1970) and Willner (1968) is descriptive of that important ingredient which makes messianic leadership distinctive from other types of leadership. Charismatic authority presupposes that the focus is not so much on the role but on the personal dynamics of the leader. Most importantly it stresses the capacity of an individual to believe not only in himself, but also in his abilities to get others to believe in him. Thus, charisma resides in the relationship between the leader and follower, and this relationship is determined by, and interpreted against, a particular social and historical background (Willner, 1968).

Charismatic leaders thrive in societies capable of generating awe, reverence, and blind faith (Willner, 1968), and are sometimes elevated above the capabilities of ordinary persons. Thus, they often take on an almost supernatural aura and are expected to perform superhuman feats to solve complex human conditions (Laconture, 1970; Tucker, 1970; Bopegamage & Narayansurami, 1973). In essence, charismatic types, in whatever field they are found, are part and parcel of Klapp's (1974) definition of a social type found in a certain social milieu. Such a person is not a personality type in the classical psychological definitions of personality, but a person possessing a trait that is sufficiently distinctive to categorize him or her as charismatic for people who know the milieu in which he or she operates. Charisma is therefore important in the creation of symbolic leaders--select persons in all fields who have an enormous effect, not necessarily because of achievement and vocation, but because they stand for certain things and are able to create images that have symbolic meanings to the people.

In the process of moving their followers through these created images, such symbolic leaders satisfy their followers on an important psychological level. In light of this, Klapp (1964) postulated that "what Weber called the force of charisma in history is really the force of drama" (p. 254). Much of the related literature that discusses the concept of charisma emphasizes the relationship of the leader's internal needs to the outer socio-political factors of the society. The general consensus amongst the leading scholars in the field is that the individual's actions cannot be divorced from the aspirations and visions held by his society. Charismatic action, like other dimensions of human consciousness, is determined by social reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). Therefore, an understanding of charisma is contingent on an understanding of the socio-historical forces that shaped the societies and the time periods in which the phenomenon is evidenced. Charisma, as a concept, can be applied to an understanding of persons as historical actors within the context of history, but such interpretation is limited to the constraints of time and space. Thus Merleau-Ponty posits that "there is no universally applicable concept," but that "concepts are relevant for particular historical periods and configurations ... concepts are clarified through a dialogue with the material one is interpreting" (Rabil, 1965, p. 148). In this thesis, the relevant concept is exemplified through the dialogue that is established with written material and with people.

Charismatic action will be defined here in the process of interpreting Michael Manley's actions during his term as Prime Minister of Jamaica, and by attending to the themes of his philosophy of Democratic Socialism. This process links a legal-rational politician to the framework of the charismatic. By so doing, it demonstrates that both bases for the legitimization of leadership are compatible in some societies. Furthermore, the case will be made that the distinguishing quality that sets Michael Manley apart from his predecessors is his ability to go beyond the bread and butter issues of economic development and socio-political structural changes, and reach the emotional and attitudinal base that characterized Jamaica's historical responses to popular leadership and cult figures.

Significance of the Study

Any analysis of Michael Manley's contribution to the political development of Jamaican society, and the related impact on the Third World, potentially contributes to the ever-growing field of scholarship that deals with the structural and psycho-social problems of developing societies. In addition to this, the use of charisma as a differentiating feature of political leadership fulfills a vital theoretical need in the understanding of some revolutionaries and revolutionary movements. In this framework, Michael Manley's political career offers a unique opportunity to analyse the dynamics of the socio-historical realities of Jamaican society, interacting with the political philosophy and leadership style of a controversial and imaginative leader.

Limitations and Specific Restrictions of the Study

1. A study of a political leader poses some practical assessment problems. These include the inaccessibility of the investigator to prominent informants who are not only limited by the demands on their

time but are predisposed to remain elusive, mystical and private. In this study such general problems were accentuated by the nature of the Jamaican political climate and by the nature of the elite sample. Elite interviewing is particularly difficult but more so in societies that are either politically volatile or confronted with crises. In such circumstances an investigator can easily be seen as either having ulterior motives for carrying out a particular type of research, or as being a supporter of a particular political party or political ideology. Even when the investigator is not seen as partisan in terms of the established political parties, elites in a small society are very careful about divulging information on private matters. This kind of consideration sometimes causes them to (a) avoid controversial issues and questions, (b) try subtle ways of converting the investigator to their point of view, (c) deliberately distort events so as to project either a positive or negative picture and (d) tailor their comments to appeal to the audience that will be exposed to the information.

All of these obvious limitations could affect the results of the study. However, participant observation techniques were used and I interacted with many other persons who could give valuable information on political events. Many of these persons were met in social and other informal settings. Their interpretation of events and persons were not often opposed to those of interviewees identified with either of the political parties.

2. This study recognizes the applicability of the concept of charisma to other political leaders and to other socio-historical trends in the Jamaican political history, but it dealt most directly with post-independence Jamaica and focused the major part of its attention on

Michael Manley and his times.

3. This study is restricted to the messianic qualities of only one leader, Michael Manley.

4. The focus is on the societal basis for Michael Manley's messianism and his impact during his two terms as Prime Minister (1972-1980).

5. The interviewees were selected from those who have had direct involvement with different levels of the Jamaican government, either as parliamentarians, commentators, technocrats or advisors.

6. All interviews needed to be done in a four-month period.

7. Some of the interviewees were not able to give more than an hour of their time for the interviews. Because of this, some issues could not be followed up in greater detail.

8. All but one of the interviewees were men. There is, therefore, a sex bias in the sample. Of course, this is a reflection of the fact that there are very few women in the top levels of the political leadership in any of the political parties. However, this obvious sex bias does not render the study invalid. This is so because the important criterion for selection as an interviewee is the individual's level of involvement with the Jamaican political system.

Plan and Overview of the Study

This study is designed to investigate the development and outcome of the messianic leadership style of Michael Manley. In order to have a coherent framework in which to discuss the relevant issues and personalities directly connected with this development, the relationship between the societal factors and the individual's action must be emphasized. With this in mind, the following chapter descriptions illustrate an effort to focus directly on Michael Manley as a political actor within a given milieu.

The concept of charismatic leadership and its relevance to messianism and to an understanding of Michael Manley's impact on Jamaican society is the focus of Chapter One. Chapter Two is a literature review which, in the framework of a general discussion of leadership, gives a more elaborate description of the charismatic style as distinct from other types of political leadership. How the relationship of charismatic action to religious energies becomes the role of messianic and millenarian cults in the generation of a charismatic political climate is revealed. Chapter Three discusses the method used to study the phenomenon of the charismatic appeal of Michael Manley. Chapter Four is a critical analysis highlighting the relevant socio-historical issues which form the base for charismatic leadership and the impact that Michael Manley had on Jamaican society. The role of slavery and the resultant plantation society as the mainspring for the analysis of the role of the Free Coloureds and their contribution to the psycho-social forces in messianic leadership is discussed. These forces are further elaborated on in a section on the development and meaning of the Rastafarian cult. Consequently, the nature of the leadership of the two dominant political parties and the relationship of these to the socio-political and economic realities of the society can be given a certain perspective in the search for messianic and/or charismatic leaders.

In Chapter Five the results of the interviews are given, and the main issues related to the process are elaborated. Chapter Six is the actual interview that was done with Michael Manley. This interview is deliberately set by itself to substantiate the findings and to present a self-analysis of Michael Manley. There is no analysis of this because the interview clearly and eloquently speaks for itself. Of significance, is the fact that this interview was done after the invasion of Grenada and after the uncontested Jamaican elections. The contents of such an interview will be very valuable to psycho-historians and political scientists. A summary of the study and its main conclusions are the focus of Chapter Seven. In addition, this chapter also discusses the implications for further research in the area.

Definition of Terms

Charisma: [Greek: Kharisma, favor, divine gift; from kharizesthai, to favor; from kharis, grace favor].

The Houghton Mifflin Canadian Dictionary of the English Language defines charisma as "a rare quality or power attributed to those persons who have demonstrated an exceptional ability for leadership and for securing the devotion of large numbers of people". Charisma was used by Weber (1947) to apply to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which the individual is set apart from ordinary persons. In this process, the individual is treated as if he or she is endowed by supernatural, super human or other exceptional qualities.

Charismatic authority doesn't put the focus on the individual's role but on personal dynamics and on the process by which an individual comes to believe in himself, and in his ability to make others believe in him. Charisma resides in the relationship between leader and follower--a cluster of emotional and cognitive reactions (Willner, 1969).

Charistmatic Leadership: is a relationship between leader and follower, defined in a particular social and historical background. Though universal in its application, charismatic action and conditions are culture specific and time bound. This may cause the phenomenon to be short-lived and unstable. The follower's perception of the leader is crucial to the definition of the leader as charismatic. Similarly, the ability of the individual to project himself as an extraordinary person is important to the concept. More than other persons in the community, the charismatic leader is:

> able to formulate or elaborate on a compelling doctrine that embodies the private dreams and desires of many different people and elevates these into a public and frequently millenial vision. (Willner, 1968, p. 22)

Millenarian Movements: Milleranian movements represent a type of social consciousness which presents a vision of a different social order (Wilson, 1973). These movements, reflecting certain degrees of tension with the world, have a religious overtone. The primary theme is a protest against the impact on the individual or on the collective of the things in this world. Thus, millenarian movements generally advocate and/or hope for a time when the present order will give way to a better future. Such movements are generally spawned by oppression and deprivation--thus they hope for a reign of good over evil.

Messianic Cults: Messianic cults are part of the general definition of millenarian movements. In these cults the idea of a leader (symbolic or actual) is inherent. Historically, the concept is identified in many cultures, and over vast time periods. However, the present day conception of messiah is linked to themes in the Judaeo-Christian traditions.

The Rastafarians: The Rastafarians are a native-born and native-bred Jamaican cult. The basic belief system of the cult members was inspired by the teachings of Marcus Garvey, one of Jamaica's national heroes. Inherent within the Rastafarian world view is a rejection of the oppressive social and economic conditions of the Jamaican society. Every authentic Rastaman wants to escape the Babylon which Jamaica has become, and return to Africa where he can gain a sense of dignity. Nettleford (1976) described the cult as a developing system of religious thought and a style of practical living that summon a groping and equivocating Jamaican society to honesty and moral certitude. In challenging the status quo and in articulating the generalized needs and fears of Jamaican society, the Rastafarians have had an overwhelming impact on the Jamaican socio-political system.

PNP: The People's National Party.

JLP: The Jamaican Labour Party.

NWU: The National Workers Union.

BITU: Bustamante Industrial Trade Union.

Busta: Nickname for Sir Alexander Bustamante, National Hero and deceased Prime Minister of Jamaica.

Elite: The Houghton Mifflin Canadian Dictionary of the English Language defines the elite as "the best or most skilled members of a given social group." The term is applicable to the power-brokers of the political parties in the Jamaican society. These persons are amongst the most skilled of those involved in the political process.

The Nature - Nurture Controversy: the debate over the relative contributions of biological and environmental factors to behaviour.

Obeah-Myal Complex: An African religious practice which went underground during the period of slavery, but which incorporated some of the trappings and rituals of Christianity. Cashmore (1979) explained this practice in the following:

> Stemming primarily from the African derived obeah-myal belief complex, black Jamaican religions oriented to a social cosmos cohabited by humans and spirits which were amenable to manipulation by those mortals holding the requisite secrets. Obeah men were those gifted with the ability to control the spirits of the dead and use them in their service. As such they were influential men and women who were often called upon to cast spells or put a hex on others (p. 15).

Traditional Authority: In Weberian terms traditional authority comes from the legitimacy that is handed down from the past. Persons gain power according to traditionally transmitted rules and by virtue of the status obtained by the traditions.

Legal-Rational Authority: In Weberian terms the base for this kind of authority rests on a belief in the legality of patterns of normative rules. Those elevated under these rules have the right to rule.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter highlights three areas that have direct relevance to an understanding of the dynamics of charismatic leadership. The first section is a review of the political personality. In this the individual and the societal dynamics are recognized. Following this is a discussion of the influence of religion on political behavior. This discussion is done in order that the historical antecedents and the complexity of messianic leadership can be more fully appreciated. This leads into the third section which reviews the role of messianic cults and millenarian movements as expressions of political action.

The Political Personality

In the political arena, certain types of persons are predisposed to make a greater impact than others, not because of any greater training or formal preparation for the role of leader and/or politician, but because of the unique interplay between their personal qualities and their environment. These persons fall into the group that is generally described as being charismatic or as having a messianic personality. Messianic and charismatic, as descriptors of the construct personality, are used interchangeably to describe the same phenomenon. This interchange is an effort to isolate the qualities that make certain individuals stand out from others and behave in a way that is predictable and understandable against a particular conceptual framework.

Likewise, the concept of personality, though hypothetical (Murray and Kluckholn, 1948) is nevertheless describable and understandable in the framework of a particular theory or school of thought. The dominant schools, from which the conceptualization and definition of personality derive, generally concede that even the most independent and seemingly self-directed persons are never entirely untouched by the social and physical dimensions of the environment in which they are nurtured and socialized. (Hall and Lindsay, 1957; Maddi, 1976; Samuel, 1981).

Those who make a difference in the field of politics may or may not be the most important people in determining history, or the greatest instrument of historical forces, or the best examples of the interplay between private personality and public conditions. Some theorists take the stance that those who have a political personality emphasize the pursuit of power in preference to other values (Laswell, 1968). It is also generally recognized that individuals who are thus motivated need not seek satisfaction in pure politics but might also find it in other institutions not formally defined as political. These may include churches, universities and businesses (Fromm, 1963).

In whatever field they are found these power seekers reinterpret and expand the roles of the existing structures to meet their needs and aspirations. Such needs are best understood in the socio-historical contexts in which these individuals develop. For example, in an analysis of Woodrow Wilson's political career, George (1969) argued that the seeking of power was a compensation for low self-esteem. The younger Wilson had a domineering and forceful father who was disappointed with what he saw as shortcomings in his son. In turn, Woodrow developed low estimates of himself as a male, and in his later career as a politician dominated others in order to satisfy his need to regain his power. Also, Kurt Schumacher's role as a contending political leader in post-war Germany had been given a similar treatment by Edinger (1965). Schumacher's apparent generalized need and his disposition for rebellion and agression against the external world have been linked to his feelings of deep anxiety. All this was generated by early socialization experiences and subsequent social and psychological traumas in his adulthood.

The general thesis in the personality literature is that the base for personality formation, is greatly modified by culture and specific situations. This leads to a compromise between both the inner psychic reality and the outer social forces, which is manifested in a variety of ways. Ultimately, the type of personality that evolves on the individual level is dependent on a complex network of socialization patterns and influences which have the greatest impact on the individual's psyche (Kluckholn and Murray, 1959).

Political processes are complex and the answer to why political actors do the things they do is not definitive. If what is generally described in psychological literature as personality is definable in terms of organized internal dispositions and stability over time, then the political personality, like other types of personalities, must vary from individual to individual. Notwithstanding this variability, in political psychology "it has become a truism that personality in some unspecified way affects beliefs and political activity, and is in a dynamic relationship with social, cultural and experiential factors" (Knutson, 1973, p. 30).

There has been a long history of interest in the distinguishing features of those who rise above the rank and file and become leaders in the political arena. The search for reasons why certain men and women come to power has been recorded from the time of Plato through to modern times, and has been pursued in various world philosophies (Bobegamage and Narayansuvami, 1973).

Theorizing about the type of personality that is drawn into the political sphere is based on the highly complex process of the cumulative interaction between inner needs and external situational stimuli. Politicians are viewed as persons who naturally find their role of dominance, decision-making and power brokering, more gratifying than the roles required in other fields (Edinger, 1965). In terms of orientation such explanations of political behavior fall within the general school of psychological determinism. Recognizing that this is but one partial explanation of the phenomenon is important to any discussion of such behavior, for, in the final analysis, every psycho-historian or political psychologist must establish his or her own relationship to theory. He or she must ponder over "where to turn and selectively, convulsively, ambivalently, hostilely, doggedly, pedantically or anxiously pursue any one line of argument or school of thought" (Bartlett and Schoenwald, 1974, p. 627).

In this process of relating to theory, a person's world view and ideological convictions become important factors in the choice of a particular theoretical model of analysis. Thus convincing arguments and evidence for explaining political behavior are made in several frameworks. For instance, one explanation of the psychological forces behind the complexity of the Watergate Affair emphasized the interaction between the social structure and the individuals involved. Some of those connected with the Watergate scandal were analyzed as being at varying stages of moral development as this is conceptualized in Kohlberg's model (Candee, 1975). The fact that the affair involved issues such as lying and other unethical actions on the part of politicians as highly placed as the United States President, outraged the moral and emotional underpinnings of the Western value system and make Kohlberg's model a useful tool for evaluating this particular case. This does not mean that in such a case the analysis is anything but partial. It must be borne in mind that even though an individual demonstrates high levels of moral reasoning and mature concepts of justice measured against a reliable scale, there is no assurance that he or she will behave in highly moral ways in any given situation. Various environmental and social factors will contribute to and determine one's decisions to act in one way or the other (Berg and Mussen, 1975).

The Psychoanalytic Model is perhaps more used than any other psychological theory as an explanation of the political personality. In its linking of sexuality and the need for power, the emphasis is also on political behavior as a deviation from a balanced view of human development. This imbalance need not be seen in negative or pathological terms. For instance, Mahatma Ghandi's political development has been analysed by both Wolfenstein (1967) and Fromm (1963) as the demonstration of deliberate abnormal need deprivation which resulted in Ghandi's self reformation and also in his people's reformation. This is an example of a negative force producing positive results (Isaak, 1975).

National Character

The foregoing highlights explanations of political behavior that focus on the individual as the locus of control in any situation. Other theorists have moved beyond individual psychology to raise the question of national character as the blueprint for the actions of individuals. National character as a base for interpretation is more often used in situations of conflict between nations, and is given credence both in scientific and non-scientific writings. The highly emotional and yet unresolved issues in the current Arab-Israeli conflict have often been interpreted in the media as problems arising from the irrational nature of the Arabs. This assumed irrationality is seen as the root cause of their attidudinal rigidity towards Israel, and the main obstacle to a resolution of the conflict. Such assessment of a general trait in the Arab personality has been deduced from interpretations of child-rearing practices, family structures, religion and from the psychoanalytic interpretations of their folklore and literature (Beit-Hallahmi, 1972). A cautionary note in such interpretations must always be struck, because such explanations of international conflict run the risk of blurring the real historical and economic issues that are most often at the base of these confrontations. This was emphatically stated by Beit-Hallahmi's argument that:

> Arab hostility towards Israel was not created because of some psychological need to release tension or agression. The main cause of the conflict is not psychological but political (p. 27).

Also, Smelser (1962) pointed out that it is very difficult to deal with most nations in these terms because many of today's nations are nations because of geographical and political boundaries and not because they are homogeneous societies. This is especially true of many of the ex-colonial nations in Africa and in Asia. However, these arguments do not negate the fact that individuals within a nation are more similar to each other than they are to people of other nations and cultures. The relevance and the impact of history, culture and the total societal value system on the development of the individual cannot be dismissed. However, caution must be used when concepts such as national character are being discussed. The individual's potential to develop into a unique character must not be overlooked.

The influence of historical and socio-political conditions on social thought and ideas can be clearly demonstrated, but this does not prevent the researcher from dealing with psychological and socio-cultural systems as two levels of conceptualization interacting with and influencing each other. The most widely accepted opinion on this relationship is that the individual's personality structure is largely dependent upon the requirements of his other cultural system (Aronoff, 1967). This is not to suggest that the individual is a puppet or merely the victim of circumstances. In fact, it is demonstrable that "a person acquires and maintains attitudes and other learned psychological structures to the extent that they are in some way useful to him in his inner economy of adjustment and his outer economy of adaptation" (Smith, 1968, p. 22). In other words, components of the wider culture are internalized and become part of the personality structure.

When the linkages between the individual and his environment are established, Michael Manley's charismatic impact on the Jamaican society can be seen in terms of a personality adapting the social, cultural and psychological needs of a people to an inner dynamic. This adaptation resulted from a developmental process that fostered a natural affinity for the role of political leader.

Charismatic Leadership: The Influence of Religion on Political Behavior

The political personality is conceptualized as the unique impact of socio-cultural conditions on the individual's predisposition to become an actor in the field of politics. In using this definition the idea of different societies requiring different types of politicians becomes a valid one. If Michael Manley fits the role of charismatic leader then the dynamics of the Jamaican society are such that the messianic or charismatic type is acceptable and potentially effective in Jamaican political life.

The contemporary messianic type of leader falls within a conceptual field which is linked to the idea of messiah which in historical terms, is presumably Hebraic and has religious antecedents. This is recorded in the Old Testament literature and documented in the work of Isaiah (Chapter 53). Other religious traditions and political cultures have also exalted one individual to rule over large numbers. The word messiah, which describes such persons, has been traced from a concept developed in ancient Israel and transformed through Aramaic, Greek and Latin usage. In the Judeo-Christian tradition, persons whose lives and actions had the distinctive features of messianic ideal were chosen because they fitted the mass perception of a special being sanctioned by God or some other force external to humans. In more concrete terms, David, the slayer of the enemy Goliath, and the people's liberator from oppression, would father a line of warriors and other outstanding men. From this line would come the true Messiah.

The concept of the messiah is also tied very closely to the concept of the exile based on Nebuchadnezzer's conquest of the Jews and the banishment of the people of Judah into Babylon. The true messiah would be the one who had the mission to release his people from bondage and lead them to the Promised Land (Gratus, 1975). Such a promised land, based in the historical and religious tradition of the Jewish people, has had an impact on the various groups that have been directly or indirectly influenced by Christianity. For example, the development of the concept of Jamaica as the Babylon to which the Rastafarian children of Africa have been exiled is a case in point.

The idea of a messiah has both redemptive and revolutionary potential. These two aspects also have historical antecedents and support the belief that groups visualize messiahs in terms of their own expectations. For example, the Zealots expected the Jewish messiah to be a conquering hero. The Essence, on the other hand, expected a teacher of righteousness (Gratus, 1975). The Christian messianic ideal was the suffering servant predicted in Isaiah and demonstrated in Jesus's behavior. Perhaps his ultimate rejection was because he did not fit the popular Jewish concept of a messiah, i.e. the conquering hero.

In more contemporary times and in diverse societies and cultures, the messianic type has become a combination of both of these early conceptions, but over and above this, an added need for identity and belonging has been fostered so that the messianic search can satisfy nationalistic and liberation struggles. Thus, the messianic search is characterized by the return to one's origins. This return can be either symbolic or real. The importance of this is the desire to find self-determination and dignity in the strength of a lost and glorious past--a past that is oftentimes idealized and illusive. Franz Fanon (1965), recognized this stage in the development of political consciousness. He argued that for a society to progress to the promised land the population must move beyond this to another stage, where the lessons of the past are catalysts to revolutionary action and rebirth.

It is this deep-seated psychological yearning for reaffirmation of self-worth and dignity that messianic leaders recognize, reinforce and consciously or unconsciously attempt to fill. Such messiahs are able to respond because of their personal dynamism and their deep sense of human connection. This connection is culturally defined and determined, but is not necessarily limited by geographical boundaries.

Charisma as a Distinguishing Quality of the Messianic Type

The distinctive quality that flavours the actions and impact of messiahs is charisma, a term popularized by Max Weber (1947). Weber's definition of charisma, as that important ingredient of power which explains the mysterious influence that some leaders have over their followers, is relevant to the study of many leaders who demonstrate that gift of grace and charm which elevate them above the plane of the ordinary (Lacouture, 1970; Bopegamage and Narayanswami, 1973; Tucker, 1970). Embodying both the psychological and socio-cultural dimensions of leadership, charisma is a distinctive quality of messianic types. This is especially detectable in many Third World countries where the unique mix of historical, cultural and economic factors perpetuates potential stages for charismatic action.

As with the historical roots of messiah, charisma connotes certain prophetic qualities which are not incompatible with mysticism and magic. These qualities not only explain many of the seemingly irrational behaviors of the messianic movements, but legitimize the blind faith that the masses place in messianic leadership. These mystical and prophetic qualities have historically been linked to human religious energies. As the fundamental locus of charisma, religion is the power base of charismatic leadership. In modern times such leaders need not be identified with organized religions or established churches in order to derive power from an external metaphysical entity. This entity, identified as God or as some other extra-human agency can become 'the people' and entrust the leader with the role of interpretor and applicator of a particular doctrine, politcial or religious (Tucker, 1968; Devereux, 1955). Thus Devereux posits that:

> Charismatic leadership is justified and legitimized by a social recognition of certain special extrasocietally sanctioned qualities imputed to the personality of the leader (p. 147).

In order to be consistent with the thesis that personality is the manifestation of the dynamic interplay between internal needs and outer socio-political factors, the question of whether charisma resides mainly in the individual or mainly in the situation is highly relevant. It can be argued that charismatic leaders reflect some dimensions of individuals who are motivated by a sense and recognition of their power over others. This recognition feeds on their ego needs and on their ability to influence their followers to do things that satisfy individuals and groups. These are not always positive or productive actions. Nevertheless, they satisfy the sense of all powerfulness which has been described as part of an infantile wish imputed to two kinds of persons. One is those who grow up in secure environments where they continually get the assurance and confidence to deal with power issues; the other is those who are reared in a situation where conflict is continuously generated by their efforts to gain control of their situation. Both types of persons develop an awareness of and a feeling for their ability to make things happen. The eventual effectiveness of both will ultimately be determined by "the actual reality testing" (de Vries, 1977, p. 352). Such unresolved conflictual areas, generated in distinct socio-cultural realities, seek the same avenues of resolution. For this reason charismatic leaders appear in different classes and satisfy the needs of their followers.

Accepting the notion of charisma as the essential ingredient of the messianic type, and recognizing that leadership competence is hinged to a matching up of internal values and external reality, make it important to explore further the kinds of environment and conditions that produce this charismatic symbiosis. Such an exploration takes on the classic nature/nurture[1] overtone and must essentially remain unresolved. An extreme view is that in crisis situations the leader who believes in his or her own omnipotence can evoke in his or her followers the savior image, and they in turn, develop a dependence upon his or her ability to deliver whatever they need at the moment. Their dependence, therefore, fuels the leader's self love and strengthens the belief in his or her powers and makes him or her act in ways which perpetuate follower's dependency--thereby setting in motion the dynamic link between inner needs and external reality (de Vries, 1977). This puts the greater emphasis on the leader as an all-powerful being and the followers as rather mindless masses. This conceptualization also sees charisma as abnormal in the prejorative clinical sense of the word--as a a sickness within the body politic and as "inherently a symptom of irresponsibility and of political immaturity appearing under a variety of circumstances in a variety of cultures" (Shark, 1969, p. 89)

---

[1] See Definition of terms in Chapter 1.

Politics and Religion: A Base for Charisma

Charisma, therefore, is a unique quality that is distinct within a social setting and within a particular time frame in this setting. Moving away from this over-emphasis on the individual is the idea that charismatic leaders' actions cannot be examined purely against their unique personality and ego needs, but must be seen as the outcome of the dynamic interaction between the needs of their society and their ability to embody these needs. The task here is not to determine the genesis of charisma, as formulated by Weber and discussed by many others, but to demonstrate that this notion meets a vital theoretical need and is indispensible to the study of revolutionaries and revolutionary movements.

The realms of politics and religion interpenetrate in complex ways. Because of this, the notion of charisma, though historically rooted in magic, has relevance in a less magical age. Although today's leaders operate in a highly technological and scientific millieu, religion has not necessarily lost its hold on them. According to Tucker (1968) they have merely displaced religious emotions into other areas of operation, and politics is an apt stage for religious cum charismatic action.

Having identified a type that fits the charismatic, it must be borne in mind that the charismatic like Adorno et al's (1950) authoritarian or any other formulated personality heuristic type is useful for a specific purpose and situation. In practice, a personality type is construed in accordance with a purpose that is specific to this or that situation. Thus what is being proposed is a way of dealing with a partial formulation that is meant to be sufficient for a specific purpose (Murray and Kluckholn, 1948).

In short, the messianic politician embodies the concept of charisma that is defined by Weber (1947) as the quality that elevated certain leaders above other leaders in their society. This concept which describes a special relationship of an individual to his environment and is fundamentally located in the world of religion, has been found to be very descriptive of the most powerful of Third World leaders. This factor can be attributed to the unique historical, cultural and economic factors that shape the reality of many Third World countries. These situations nurture charismatic leadership which is specifically salvationist in nature and is perhaps the key concept in any study of political messianism.

Religion appears to be an integral part of the development process of all peoples. Wherever a human is found, he or she acts as if there is an intrinsic need to explain himself or herself in relationship to some force external to his or her activities. This need for a link with a supernatural being pervades much of human activity either directly or indirectly. Over time this has produced attitudes, beliefs and actions which seem far removed from the popular definitions of religious activities. Messianism in politics is an example of a notion based on a religious system being transferred to a non-religiously defined area.

The relationship between religious energies and political action is easily grasped if organized religion is viewed as an attempt to respond to two levels of human needs--the spiritual and abstract level that motivates people to prepare for the hereafter, and the concrete practical level of dealing with hardships of existence as temporary phenomena. Religion then, is a system in which people struggle with the ultimate problems of human nature, interacting with all areas of social and spiritual life (Geyer, 1963). The interaction of religion and politics is therefore a natural condition of human society.

Religion has been analyzed as serving five main functions of loyalty: a source of loyalty, a sanction for loyalty, a sanction of conflict, a sanctuary from conflict, and a reconciler of conflict (Geyer, 1963). The source of loyalty is based on the premise that all believers in any religious community are united by a sense of loyalty derived from a centre which focuses on God and creed. The transference of this loyalty to a political figure is not difficult. It is seen in many instances where political parties become cults and their leaders become cult figures. Commitment to one party over another is not qualitatively different from commitment to one religious denomination as opposed to another. The reasons for loyalty, in both instances, are generally emotive and based sometimes on family and class traditions rather than on reasoned evaluation of the situation. The link from the source to the sanction of loyalty is so strong that in many cases loyalty to a political view is perceived as a religious obligation. There are many examples of this in the great world religious traditions. For instance both Christianity and Islam have, over time, established ties amongst diverse peoples and cultures and have fostered the idea of global communities tied to certain dogma. The idea of a community based on religious beliefs has been the mainspring of a number of political movements and the emergence of many powerful and influential world leaders. A good example of this is the spread of Catholicism amongst the diverse races and cultures.

Moving from sanctioning loyalty to sanctioning conflict is very understandable amongst political types. The current conflicts in Northern Ireland, Iran and the Middle East are all examples of atrocities that are often justified on grounds of religious loyalties even when other frameworks of analysis are more logical and obvious. Sanctioning of conflict is one extreme on the continuum of the relationship between religion and politics. In some instances less overt involvement is generated, and some religious communities become oriented away from the purely political and military activity of their society and resort to isolationism sanctioned by the transcendent tenets of their faith (Geyer, 1963).

It is in its role of reconciler of conflict that religion has its most complex link with political activity. In this role, the formal institution, representing organized religion, must take a stance on the link between secular and spiritual life, and on the moral and ethical issues in situations of conflict. In recent times such institutions have had to confront complex, emotional, and highly volatile situations of injustices and inequalities in a variety of places including North America, the Middle East, Europe, Africa and Latin America.

Latin America is one example of a region in which organized religion is intertwined with political life. This link is traceable to the nature of the contact between Spaniards and the indigenous peoples of the region. When the Spaniards discovered the region, they found many advanced cultures in which religious practices and institutions were well entrenched. A number of the rituals and attitudes towards the supernatural were not incompatible with those of the European churches. The process of superimposing the Catholicism of the Conquistadores on the indigenous rites of the native populations was, therefore, psychologically fulfilling and militarily and politically beneficial. Certain aspects of the Inca religion, especially those related to magic, were so powerfully ingrained that they could adapt to any other belief system without being too dramatically altered. Similarly, the external trappings of the Catholic rituals appealed to the Indians and they could readily relate to the new religion without necessarily comprehending the cultural meanings inherent in the rituals and trappings. "Their societies never made a clear distinction between spiritual and temporal realities and could easily be transformed into systems where political control incorporated ecclesiastical control" (Mariategui, 1971, p. 135).

Several historians including Northrop (1947) isolate the Christian religion as the single most devastating force during the Spanish colonization of Latin America. On one level, this is a very valid argument especially when the strategies of the church leaders resulted in the negation of all but the imposed values of Catholicism. Yet one must not overlook the potential of religious systems to be transposed into other systems. The Patron Saint of Mexico, the Virgin of Guadalupe, played the dual role of helping the Mexican relate to Christianity through a deity in the image of an Indian woman, and became the rallying force for resistance to the oppression of the conquest (Northrop, 1947). Religion in this case sanctioned a people's desire for freedom and dignity. It can therefore be argued that the most notable resultant characteristic of the meeting of European and Indian cultures in Mexico is religiosity, and this factor has the greatest potential as a liberating force (Ramos, 1962).

The marriage of church and political institutions is a dominant theme in most countries and in various religious traditions. The emphasis so far has been on the practices within the Christian tradition but the link between religious beliefs and social structures is exemplified in other systems. For instance, in Hinduism, the caste system and the related values are rooted in religion. The general belief was that:

> Birth into a particular class was the result of actions (Karma) in earlier existence, and only by diligently fulfiling the obligations of his caste could an individual hope to be reborn into a higher order. In this there was no escape from the caste order. (Lewy, 1974, p. 114).

In this system, social conditions are perceived as being sanctioned by God or some other external mystical force. Similarly in Confucianism and Buddhism, the intertwining of political and religious authority is a dominant feature. The historical link of religions and political institutions and the easy transferability of religious energies to other areas of human endeavor provide a conceptual framework for dealing with charismatic and/or messianic leadership in the field of politics.

Religious Responses to Political Action: Messianic Cults and Millenarian Movements.

The transference of religious energies and motifs into the political arena is best demonstrated by the role of messianic cults and millenarian movements. These phenomena, inspired by the hope that when man's earthly conditions become intolerable there will be divine intervention, have historically had political overtones. The concept of the millenarian rests on the thousand year period described in the Christian traditions and based on the biblical account in the book or Revelation (Chapter 20, Verses 4-6):

> And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them and judgement was given upon them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God ... Blessed and whole is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death has no power but they shall reign with him a thousand years.

This original idea of redemption is transferred conceptually and symbolically to any vision of a promised land or to a better time in the future. This adaptation to the fulfillment of unique dreams in diverse situations shows that the thinking, in which millenial dreams are embedded, has a logic of its own and can only be understood in the context of the cultural and social conditions under which it developed. Any religious movement inspired by the fantasy of a salvation which is "collective, terrestrial, imminent, total, and accomplished by agencies linked to the supernatural, is a millenarian movement" (Thrupp, 1970, p. 32).

Interconnected to millenarian dreams is the hope for the special one, the Messiah, who will take the reins of power and usher in the new day where all is right. The recurrence of this messianic theme in diverse languages and religions suggest that universally people have placed their hope for the final solution of any overpowering difficulty in supernatural redemption through an earthly being.

In the Judeo-Christian tradition the idea of a Messiah that would take on a political role was first alluded to in the following biblical record:

> The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken in pieces; out of heaven shall be thunder upon them: the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth: and he shall give strength unto his king and exalt the horn of his annointed. (I Samuel 2:10).

In this verse both the political role and the supernatural intervention significant in the making of the messianic leader are very evident. Of course, in most cultures, the explicit political dimension of any messiah might have come about because of the history of their experience and unique political development.

In contemporary times messianic movements have appeared in very predictable patterns in a variety of geographical regions and in a diversity of cultures and social situations. This demonstrates that such a universal theme is very adaptable to situational factors. A regional appraisal of messianism reveals that in Latin America, for instance, there have been many instances of movements which are either messianic or millenarian in flavour. In pre-colonial and colonial Brazil such movements were evident amongst the Jupi-Guarani Indians whose migration patterns were intricately linked with their creation myths. These migrations were led by a medicine man, who would no doubt have taken on a powerful role of leader in this situation (Thrupp, 1971). Over time, this leader would become a predictable type because of the cultural transmission of myths and legends through the oral tradition of the pre-colonial tribes of the region.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the colonization of Latin America had created a new kind of society, the myths and legends of the Indians, Negroes and Mestizos were less rooted in omdigenous beliefs and spirituality, and more in the traditions introduced by the Christian church. One of these modern myths inspired Da Cunha to write Rebellion in the Backlands (1944). In this book, the author vividly portrayed the mysticism that surrounded the activities of Antonio Conselheiro, who led a band of backwoodsmen and fought against the troops of the Brazilian government in 1897. Conselheiro symbolized the prototypical messianic type--the prophet, an emissary sent from heaven to set his people free from their oppression. Conselheiro stood apart from his countrymen and was distinguished by his mode of dress, his life-style, and his mission. He was described as having "hair down to his shoulders, a long tangled beard, an emaciated face, and piercing eyes ... clad in blue canvas garments and leaning on a staff" (Da Cunha, 1944, p. 120-128). Like the biblical Messiah, Conselheiro had no fixed destination but wandered from place to place performing miracles which gradually enhanced his reputation as a special being.

Columbia, Argentina, Peru and other areas in Latin and South America have seen similar movements and prophets. More often than not these movements arose as responses to the need to throw off the yoke of European domination. These were evident especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In Argentina, the prophet Solares encouraged his followers to throw out the Europeans and rid themselves of foreign rule. In Peru, Juan Santos Atahuallpa built his prestige upon political authority and upon the traditions of the Incas (Lanternarri, 1963). It is significant that in most of these anti-colonial movements the indigenous beliefs were the springboard for the hope of a messiah who would eventually set his people free.

Such movements in the Americas reflected the need for the Latin American person to be liberated on two levels--a practical level of overt domination by one economic class, and the psychological level of identity and personhood. Colonization has been very effective not only in denying indigenous peoples their economic rights but also in creating societies in which people are forced to deny their authenticity by negating the values of the indigenous traditions which were always considered inferior to those of the colonizing force.

In North America, movements to regain the dignity that was lost through the negation of cultures and economic relationships are very evident. The Ghost Dance, which sprung up amongst the Plains Indians when the buffalo disappeared, is a case in point. In their fantasy, the Indians hoped for the eventual disappearance of the white man and the return to their traditional life style and economic base. Similarly, the Iroquois responded to their conquest in the Handsome Lake cult which laid great stress on moral values and the hope of return to an imagined, or real, past glorious state of good living. The cult of Peyotism, found amongst many of the Indian tribes in the Western U.S.A., also contains elements of magic and the theme of hope for the return of respect and identity that were lost through the process of colonization and contact with European cultures (Aberle, 1970).

In the Southern United States, the socio-psychological conditions of the oppressed black population also generated various religious cults and a general theme of religiosity that seems to aid them in coping with institutionalized racism. This theme is captured in Black Christian Nationalism and in the Black Nation of Islam. This is a response to the inability of the other established denominations to deal effectively with the socio-political conditions related to being black in the U.S.A. Basic to Black Christian Nationalism is the belief that the Blacks are the chosen people, and to achieve their salvation they must reject individualism and be opposed to the Protestant ethic. This movement also combines the basic tenets of the Christian churches with the psychological need to regain a lost identity, in order to refashion the "Jesus bag into a black cornucopia of spiritual riches" (Grier and Cobbs, 1971, p. 180).

A review of the general threads running through a variety of cultures point to cults as diverse as the Afro-Brazilian cult (Leacock, 1975), the Cargo Movements of the Melanesians (Lawrence, 1964), the Indian Shakers (Barnett, 1972) and Black Christian Nationalism (Cleage, 1972). All these movements are major attempts at coping with the socio-psychological conditions of societies in which a racial or socio-economic group experiences oppression on a variety of levels. Messianic and millenarian movements are therefore, rooted in social conditions. In order to properly analyze them the social dynamics and power relations amongst various groups in society must be clarified. The lack of security on both social and psychological levels creates conditions where groups hope for redemption through the actions of a powerful leader.

The emphasis so far has been on movements that have sprung up amongst groups and classes that are evidently the underdogs of their society. This does not mean that groups that are not generally defined as oppressed do not have the need for messianic types. Deprivation is a relative term which is applicable in situations where people do not necessarily lack material goods. However, deprivation is experienced on another level if messianic movements are possible in such situations. It has been demonstrated that "wherever people embrace a millenial doctrine they are experiencing a relative deprivation of a kind that affects their total worth (Allan, 1974, p. 298). The Irvingite movement which occurred in Britain in the 1930's is an example of this. This movement was a middle class one which arose when the economic and social conditions caused the society to change very rapidly.

Summary

From the foregoing, it becomes obvious that any individual develops through a process of complex interactions between internal and external forces. In this context, the individual who becomes charismatic in the political arena, is a product of an environment which has the prerequisite conditions for the generation of messianic hope. Such hope can be focussed on the redemptive force in one powerful leader, or on the liberating possiblilities of cults and movements. Millenarian and messianic movements flourish in societies characterized by a high degree of religiosity. They provide a source of hope, mix elements of truth and reality with elements of fantasy, and allow people to experience the aesthetic appeal of the idea of a perfect age with a new type of leadership (Thrupp, 1970). They are, therefore, healthy responses to human existential realities and must be taken as serious efforts in the process of people development and societal change.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

According to Greenstein (1969) three approaches to the study of political behavior have been most widely used over time. They are:

A. The Case Study in which attention is paid to both the political actors' gross and verbal behavior in terms of environmental stimuli. This approach, described by Clark (1958) as a synthetic method, is predicated on the belief that an understanding of the psychology of the individual will lead to an understanding of the psychology of others in similar situations. In addition to this, from a single actor case study there will be a generation of general laws which have the potential of predictability and validation.

B. The Typological Study in which political actors are classified as belonging to one type or another.

C. Aggregative Analysis which uses the knowledge obtained from the study of individuals and types in order to explain aspects of the system in which they operate.

Clearly, each of these approaches is not mutually exclusive. Each merely highlights the emphasis of a particular work and the conceptual frame from which the analyst is operating. These are also not new approaches. They are old techniques that can be selectively adapted to interpretation of new settings.

The case study is the approach that is the most appropriate category for this study of Michael Manley as a messianic political leader. This approach allows for an understanding of how the individual is affected by societal factors and vice versa. It also allows for the individual politician to be understood within a framework of a typology --the Charismatic. It is also a method that recognizes the aggregative nature of national characteristics and generalized population needs, drives and motivation. The inter relationship between each of the three analytic modes has been schematically represented by Greenstein (1969) in the following:

Aggregative Analysis

Individual Case Study

Typological Study

(Journal of Social Issues, vol. xxiv, No. 3, 1968, p. 5).

The adoption of the case study is done with a consciousness of the major pitfalls of most attempts at analysing the life and times of prominent politicians. It is also used with a clear idea of the inherent limitations of single case studies, typologies and aggregative analysis. Such limitations are not necessarily the result of faulty conceptualization but can be largely attributed to the very nature of political life. Studying political leaders poses very practical assessment problems. Any such study is restricted by the relative inacessibility of the investigator to prominent politicians, many of whom do not have time to participate in any meaningful research. Others have the need to remain elusive, mystical and private. This distancing serves a dual purpose. It not only gives privacy to leaders but it mitigates the fear that they have of anyone who attempts any in depth study of them, especially those studies which purport to use a psychological frame of reference in the understanding of the politician's motives, needs and drives (Hermann and Milburn, 1977). For instance, Zaleznik (1975) attempted to develop an understanding of the life and times of Dwight Eisenhower but he was kept away from anyone close to the President because of the fear that the President's reputation could only be harmed and not helped by a psychological interpretation of his leadership. Such reaction is partially linked to a general skepticism of this kind of inquiry, and a fear of any kind of approach that might question a leader's private motives. Single case studies that depend too much on psychological analysis have been criticized as being too subjective, unreliable, and unreplicable--thus too idiosyncratic. The dominant criticism is that depth psychology has been "too arbitrary in its interpretation and has generally been used to overemphasize pathology over individual strengths and creativity" (Greenstein, 1968, p. 18).

Any method, approach or concept that is over used runs the risk of vulgarization. However, this is usually attributable to application of concepts in inappropriate situations. Over time, scholars have attempted various approaches to the complex issue of political behaviour and have used tools such as questionnaires, interviews, content analysis and biographical statistics either exclusively or in a variety of combinations. Each of these methods of investigation has limited effectiveness because of the nature of inquiry into political behavior.

The issues of inaccessibility and image maintenance restrict the use of questionnaires and structured interviews, except in the case of low profile politicians. Generally, high profile politicians and national leaders are not amenable to these approaches, because of the issues of privacy and generalized fear discussed earlier. However, if an investigator is able to develop a trust relationship with those who protect the leader from the public scrutiny of private motives, the possibility of an open ended interview designed to assess the politician's perception of events, responses to hypotheses and opinions on issues is possible.

Content analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative types have been widely used in studies of politicians. This approach is based on the notion that what people say and write are important to an understanding of what they do or do not do. It is also an appropriate alternative to the other tools because of the inaccessibility of the politician and the ready availability of written materials--a most convenient source of information (Hermann and Milburn. 1977). All these approaches (questionnaires, interviews and content analysis of documents), can be applied in conjunction with any formulated or adopted theoretical framework. Generally, most of the studies of political actors make some use of content analysis of their speeches and materials written about them. Erickson's (1958) psycho-social study of Luther's life and times; Wolfenstein's (1967) psychoanalysis of the political actions of Lenin, Trotsky and Ghandi; and Leite's (1951) use of the operational code in his seminal work on the Bolshevik revolution, are all examples of alternative theoretical conceptualization applying qualitative content analysis to written materials.

For the purpose of this study a conceptual framework of the messianic in which both situational factors and the individual psychological make-up interact, is most appropriate. It is recognized that it is not sufficient to inquire about the politician in isolation from the expectations of his society and from the historical antecedents that set the stage for any kind of future political action. This is therefore a multi-strategy approach in which divergent ideas merge in an attempt to establish a coherent theory for the analysis of charismatic leadership in the Jamaican society.

The basic issue in this study is not the generation of theory to justify the continued interest in political behavior, rather it is the question of using the most appropriate method of analysis in the understanding of such behavior. It is recognized that the appropriateness of any approach is determined by socio-cultural factors and by the frame of reference of any conceptual model of analysis.

The nature of charisma in Jamaican political development is conceptualized as the outcome of the interaction among three forces--the socio-historical development of the Jamaican society, the resultant impact on people's psycho-social reality, and the type of leader important to socio-political change at a particular point in the island's history. Schematically this interaction has resulted in societal characteristics that have aided a detectable millenarian tradition. Within this tradition is the idea that societies which have a prolonged stress experience, will exhibit millenarian motifs and will seek a "charismatic prophet-figure capable of moulding existing doctrine to the needs of the moment" (Barkum, 1974, p. 187).

Using these three features as the mainspring of charismatic leadership, I have established, through an analysis of Jamaican socio-political development, the recurring theme of a search for a messianic leader.

Method Used In The Study

Three sources of information have been used in order to establish a coherent model for the analysis of the charismatic dimension of Michael Manley's leadership style. This three source approach was adopted to ensure closure within this heuristic framework. The data for this study was collected in Jamaica between September 1st and December 29th, 1983.

Source I

Source I is an analysis of the development of the charismatic in Jamaican political life. In this analysis, contained in Chapter IV, is an acknowledgement of the contributions of some of the socio-political trends and personalities that have enhanced Michael Manley's charisma. Special attention was paid to the meanings of the Manleys' lineage, and the historical position and attitudes of the Free Coloured caste.

The role of Edna Manley as wife of Norman Manley and as mother of Michael Manley was also critically assessed. This was done in order to ellucidate her contributions to the complex of meanings that surrounded Michael Manley in 1972. The legacy of Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante to Jamaica's political development and to the dynastic significance of the Manley family, was also highlighted. In order to keep this within the perspective of the societal forces, a brief overview of the Jamaican messianic search was included in the discussion.

Chapter IV was designed as an important source of the information which was necessary in the establishment of a heuristic framework, within which the information from the other sources could be appreciated. Michael Manley's impact was analyzed and understood in terms of the extent to which he did or did not ignore the contributions of all these forces. In analyzing these socio-historical forces, careful attention was paid to newspaper documents, historical writings, and the writings of Jamaican scholars who have used a variety of approaches in order to contribute to a better understanding of their society. This process clarified the factors that limit and/or enhance charisma in Jamaican politics.

This heuristic model was the first phase of this analytic framework. It allowed me to focus on Michael Manley in order to understand how his political development was realized in his attitudes, words and actions. The case has been made that Michael Manley possessed the attributes that are associated with saviour, prophet or demagogue in his culture.

Source II

The second source of information came through a process of participant observations of the formal workings of the PNP political machinery. I was given observer status to attend the 45th Annual Conference of the PNP. This conference was held from September 21st to 25th, 1983 at the National Arena in Kingston, Jamaica.

As an observer, I was privileged to be able to attend all public and closed sessions of this conference, and I availed myself the opportunity of discussions with many of the leaders within the PNP. Through these discussions I gained a better understanding of the personality conflicts, the ideological differences and the nuances of the debates that took place during the closed sessions. I was also able to sense the continuing charismatic impact of Michael Manley's presence.

These five days of immersion within the PNP's formal structure were intellectually stimulating and extremely beneficial to the findings of this study.

Source III

The third source of information was obtained through open ended interviews and dialogues with Michael Manley and other select persons. These persons included family members, PNP party supporters, JLP party supporters, and others connected with various aspects of the political and social life in Jamaica. All the interviewees have had direct dealings with Michael Manley's political development, policies and actions, and all have had to observe and understand his leadership style.

The Interviewees (Sample).

The interviews were obtained from a group of seventeen persons who are distinguished by their experience, training and involvement with the political processes in Jamaica. These persons are a very representative set of the power brokers in the society and as such they are an elite group. They represent members of the Manley family, supporters of the People's National Party (PNP) and members of opposition parties. These latter were an opposition in terms of party politics, and not in terms of parliamentary status. In 1983, when the interviews were being done, the PNP was the Opposition in Parliament, and Michael Manley was the Leader of the Opposition. The governing party was the JLP under the leadership of Prime Minister, Edward Seaga.

Amongst the persons interviewed were two Members of Parliament who held ministerial portfolio in the government (JLP). One of these was a man who had defected from the PNP, and the other was a man who had been detained for subversive activities during the Michael Manley's regime. Included in the sample were two journalists, both of whom have been quite controversial in their responses to the political process while the PNP was in power. In stark ideological terms, these four interviewees formed the group that was totally opposed to Michael Manley's political world view. For purposes of description and manageability, and for these purposes only, these persons are conceptualized as more right wing in their political views.

Along a continuum that can be described as left of centre in political terms, is another group of interviewees. These include one clergyman, a leader of the communist party (WPJ), one former diplomat, one youth leader and two trade unionists. The insights of these persons were complimented by the responses of two members of the Manley family. The rest of the interviews were with lecturers and professors in the Faculties of Social Science and Government at the University of the West Indies. Each of these had served in the capacity of advisors and/or technocrats with the People's National Party. Some continued to serve in this way, even though the party was no longer in power.

The level of education amongst the persons interviewed for this study far exceeds the level of education of the general Jamaican population. Every one of these persons has had formal education up to and above the level of graduate school. In light of this, these persons as a group are quite distinct from the majority of the Jamaican people. The logic and content of their responses prove that they are all astute observers and are well informed. They bring to these interviews a very high level of sophistication and an extensive knowledge of the workings of their society.

Though relatively small in numbers in a society with almost two and one-half million people, this group of persons has access to more information about their society than any statistically representative sample would have. The social structure of the Jamaican society presumes that the bulk of the information and quality education will be accessible to a relatively small sector of the population. As such then, Jamaica is a society that is controlled politically by a small middle class sector and economically by an even smaller business and upper class sector. A number of the persons within this interview complex, have multi-class linkages in that they are genuinely products of the working and peasant classes. They have achieved middle class status by virtue of their education and by virtue of the lifestyle which their occupations afford them. Others were born into the middle class and a few are descendants of the traditional elite class.

In spite of their roots these persons have come to share a common set of material class symbols and a common set of class understandings. So, in this sense they are a homogeneous group. On the other hand, they are ideologically diverse and cover the broad political spectrum from the very radical, in Marxist-Leninist terms, through the moderates to a few who for all intents and purposes can be labelled as extreme right wingers. They also include those within this spectrum who perceive themselves as objective and above partisan politics when they analyse issues. Thus, some of the supporters of the PNP attempt in these interviews, to demonstrate their support of the party, while they play the role of impartial critics of Michael Manley's role as a leader within the party.

I gained access to the persons interviewed through the assistance of staff-members of the Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University of the West Indies. I was also assisted by the staff of the People's National Party Headquarters, who set up the machinery for making sure that I could have sufficient time to interview Michael Manley.

This process of networking was very beneficial because in a small society such as Jamaica the key players in any formal process are easily identifiable. Less identifiable is the informal network of influences and personal relationships. This is best known by those who have knowledge of the inside workings of the political and social systems. Also, when someone from outside of a community seeks to gain access to information, he or she needs to be sponsored by people who have credibility within the community. My work was therefore greatly enhanced by the assistance that I received from the Institute of Social and Economic Research and from the PNP Headquarters.

The Interview Procedure

Once the interviewees were identified, and the way of gaining access to them was detailed, I made initial contact and introductions to them either by telephone or in person. On these occasions they were acquainted with me, with the nature of the study and with the reasons for the kind of investigation that I was doing. An appointment was then made for a formal interview of at least one hour in duration.

All interviews were done in the privacy of the homes or offices of the interviewees and each had a choice of either having his or her responses recorded on tape or having them written. All but five persons agreed to have the interviews taped. These two methods resulted in a difference in the amount of information that each gave. However, no method could be identified as qualitatively better than the other. All the interviewees were extremely cooperative and willing to contribute their ideas to the study.

The interview was structured to start off with a major probe. I worded this along the following lines:

> I would like to discuss with you the leadership style displayed by Michael Manley during his term as Prime Minister of Jamaica and as leader of the PNP. I am interested in finding out how he came to be distinct from his predecessors in terms of his meanings and his impact on the Jamaican society. You are being asked to assist in this because you have been identified as one of the persons who has had a long involvement with the political process. You have also observed Mr. Manley in a variety of situations. I need to understand the kind of person Mr. Manley is and identify the qualities that distinguish him--I wish you to discuss your perceptions of both his strengths and his weaknesses.

This probe was modified somewhat to address the special relationship that the person might have had with Michael Manley. For instance, when family members were being interviewed, the probe included the fact that they were being asked to assess his role both as a private and as a public person.

The use of the major probe was very deliberate because of the nature of the group. As a subset of the power brokers, they are highly educated and exceptionally articulate. I assumed that they would be more inclined to elaborate on the themes at great lengths. The kinds of responses that are recorded in the interviews justified this assumption and the approach. All the interviews are marked by the elaborations in the opening statements and demonstrate that each individual used the probe as a method of giving his or her general opinion of Michael Manley. It was also used to emphasize the particular bias or sphere of influence of the individual.

Many of the questions that followed the major probe were formulated around the themes and issues introduced by the interviewees. Others were asked to focus the discussion on the issues that I considered significant. This approach resulted in a format that tailored each interview to the individual while it still raised the same general themes. This allowed me to analyse these themes from a variety of perspectives.

CHAPTER IV

THE GENESIS OF CHARISMA:
MICHAEL MANLEY'S MEANINGS TO THE JAMAICAN SOCIETY

Introduction

In Weber's formulation of charisma, the charismatic leader has that special gift of grace--that legitimizing force that comes not from his office or from his position but from his personal attributes. In such a framework, the relevant questions in the assessment of Michael Manley's charisma are related to the complex of meanings that he has for the Jamaican society. His gift must be seen as the ability to connect with the broad base of socio-historical and psychological factors that make Jamaica and Jamaicans unique forces in the development of the individual's psyche. Crucial to an understanding of Michael Manley's meanings to the Jamaican masses is an appreciation of these aspects of the country's socio-political history.

The first of these is the historical antecedents of Michael Manley's class and background--hence an appraisal of the historical place and impact of the Free Coloureds. This group became a class of indigenous aristocrats from which he descended. The second aspect is found in the kind of family into which he was born. Significant to this discussion is a critique of the meanings that he derived from his mother and father, and the role that these meanings had on his political impact. The third theme is to be found in the various efforts at redemption within the socio-political and religious spheres. A brief overview of the Jamaican attempts at messianic redemption will further illustrate the legacy that was Michael Manley's. This legacy contributed to the creation of the Joshua image in the 1972 election campaign. This campaign demonstrated the power and force of charismatic action in the political arena.

The Family Line: The Legacy of the Free Coloureds of Jamaica

Inherent in the understanding of the meaning of Michael Manley to the Jamaican society is an appreciation of the role of the Free Coloureds in the socio-historical development of the country. For the purposes of this study, some of the factors that impinged on the identification of this particular caste are reviewed, in order to demonstrate the genesis and the impact of certain class attitudes, biases and outlooks. Furthermore, this discussion will assist in highlighting the significance of these to the contemporary socio-political scene. It will also clarify the reasons why some people have questioned Michael Manley's sincerity.

Mosca (1939) proposes that in every society there is a class that rules and a class that is ruled, and, by extension, in every political organization there will be an individual or a number of individuals who stand out and control the action of the state, country, clan or whatever organization is established through tradition. Mosca (1939) argues that:

> Ruling minorities are usually so constituted that the individuals who make them up are distinguished from the mass of the governed by qualities that give them a certain material, intellectual or even moral superiority; or else they are the kind of individuals who possess such qualities. In other words members of the ruling minority regularly have some attribute, real or apparent, which is highly esteemed and very influential in the society in which they live (p.59).

The estimation of such individuals is due in part to the structure of the total social field. As Brown (1936) posits, there are certain field dynamic laws of leadership:

> The leader must have membership--character in the group that he is intending to lead....The leader must represent a region of high potential in the social field....The leader must realize the existing field structure....The really successful leader realized the long-term trends in the field structure (p. 342-348).

Brown (1936) further emphasized that:

> ....individuals are moulded in their tastes, aims, manners and morals by the social group into which they happen to be born, and by the groups in which they obtain membership--character during their lifetime (p. 66).

The Free Coloureds have a historical linkage with the present day social structure and with the political realities of the Jamaican society. This has afforded them high potential in the social field and a significant number of the contemporary ruling class have family lineage with the Free Coloureds. In terms of symbolic identification, it can be argued that all but a few would share the general world view that has been developed within this particular caste. In Between Black and White, Heuman (1981) extended, through the histories of identifiable individuals and events, the general themes that have been analyzed by many West Indian scholars. The works of such scholars are typified by Curtin (1955), Two Jamaicas: The Role of Ideas in a Tropical Colony, 1830-1835; Patterson (1967) Sociology of Slavery and Braithwaite (1971), The Development of Creole Society in Jamaica, 1770-1820. In his effort, Heuman demonstrates how individuals such as Michael Manley, become in Jamaican terms, part of an indigenous aristocracy, and take on a complex of meanings which carry over into crucial areas of public and private life.

The Free Coloureds of Jamaica owe their genesis to a number of sociological and economic factors that impinged on life during the decades of slave society. Campbell (1976), Hall (1975), and Heuman (1981) noted that in Jamaican slave society the Africans had numerical strength while the Europeans held economic power. As a consequence, the demographic factors of absentee landlords, single European middle management males and the shortage of European women, had a great influence on the emergence of a new caste. This process of miscegenation resulted in a group of persons that have been historically labelled coloured, freedmen, mulattos or as brownmen.

Universally, this phenomenon of hybridization has created a caste of people who have been the victims of rejection by both groups of ancestors. By the same token, it has been generally observed that the hybrid is more strongly attracted to the socio-economically dominant group because this group offers more advantages than does the native group. In these ways the Jamaican mulatto class was not unlike its counterpart in like circumstances. However, this class is distinguished from others by the fact that it had a great measure of political power at a relatively early time in Jamaican history (Campbell, 1976). This fact is significant because it forms the base on which the inheritance of wealth and the related benefits create the present leadership class. For instance Sio (1976) pointed out that as early as 1761 when:

> ....legislation was enacted to limit the legacies that Freed Coloured could inherit from whites some 200 to 30,000 pounds sterling worth of property had already been conveyed to the brown menace. In 1827 it was reported that the Free Coloureds owned many coffee and pimento plantations and a large number of houses in the town and by the 19th century an elite group

> existed among the Free Coloured consisting of the free born persons of some wealth and education (p. 12).

Therefore, one of the distinguishing features of the Free Coloured class was the fact that a number of them gained economic and political power, at a time when their black ancestors were still being enslaved and dehumanized, through the economic and social relationship of master and slave in a slave society. This is not to say that the Coloureds did not have to face their share of victimization and exclusion from some of the real and symbolic benefits of the Jamaican society. In fact they were never accepted as the social equals of the planter class. Most crucially, the men of their group had total social exclusion from interaction with whites. The coloured women, on the other hand, had to play the housekeeper-mistress cum prostitute role because she was the true ancestor of the mulatto. It was she to whom the white male turned to fulfill his sexual needs and to create the new caste. Campbell (1976) elaborates on this theme by noting that:

> ....granted the overriding power of the slave masters over their chattels within the framework of slave society then the mulatto was almost always the miscegenation between European males and their female slaves (p. 40).

Another of the distinguishing historical features of the Freed Coloured was their matrilineal lineage. This means that they did not have the right to identify with or trace their ancestral lines through their fathers. However, as Heuman (1981) argued, in spite of this, they sometimes received preferential treatment from the men who fathered them because they were perceived as being less capable, by virtue of their European ancestry, of the back-breaking work that was performed by the black slaves. They were also treated as special people by their mothers who valued their white ancestry and the lighter coloured skin that was passed on to these offspring.

Over time the Free Coloureds became a separate caste that was characterized by a number of interesting though contradictory sociological and attitudinal features. For purposes of this discussion it is important to note that they made every effort to disassociate themselves from anyone black or African. They generally considered their black ancestors as inferior and held them in even greater contempt than the Europeans did. This means that over time they did not develop as natural allies with the numerically larger black segment of the population.

In spite of their social separation from the slave class it is important to keep in mind the fact that, depending on the political and social climate, the coloured caste in Jamaican society was forced to play an ambivalent role between the forces of the white planter class and the black slave class. When it was to their advantage, or in their interest, the planter class gave privileges of inheritance, formal education and property ownership to their hybrid offsprings. However, when the coloureds were perceived as gaining too much too quickly and thereby presenting a potential threat to the balance of power, by virtue of their numerical superiority and their emotional linkages to the country, then their privileges would be curtailed. Heuman (1981) noted that:

> The privileges of freedmen presented a serious problem for the whites. Often better educated than the planters, the privileged blacks and coloureds generally adopted European values and rejected any association with slaves or any links with Africa. Many of them were wealthy and owned slaves themselves. Yet the position of the privileged freedmen upset the racial stereotype that was at the

> heart of the slave society. For the system to be successful, slaves had to associate ownership of land and people with whites; slaveholding freedmen were dangerous because their existence suggested that browns and blacks were no different from white (p. 6).

In short, the coloured caste had a unique role between black and white. They were overly Eurocentric in their aspirations. Despising anyone black and African, they psychologically denied an indisputable part of their ancestry. By doing so, they set themselves up for a certain degree of isolation from both groups. Largely urban and Europeanized, they were relegated to the outer fringes of the white society. In a real way they felt neglected, not by the blacks (since they had no desire to identify with them), but by the whites who neither trusted nor liked them. Part of this mistrust and dislike was built on the fear of the potential threat that they posed to the political and economical well being of the whites.

Despite their outsider status the Freed Coloureds emphasized their affinity with whites in a number of ways. For example:

> ....they sought to imitate European fashions often in an exaggerated form. Brown women frequently dressed in the latest and loudest English clothes to outdo their white competitors (Heuman, 1981, p. 14).

It was not only on the material level that the Free Coloureds tried to match and sometimes outdo the Europeans. They also had the reputation of treating the black slaves more brutally than the planter class would. This might have been a natural response to a society in which they were attempting to carve out a niche of power and respectability, but which rendered them unequal in spite of their achievements, aspirations and near-white features. Such a response might also have been a desperate effort to psychologically exorcise the blackness from their being. The complexity of the situation is demonstrated in the following:

> Free coloureds not only adopted white values but also tended to compensate for their lower status by abusing slaves. Many travellers reported that brown men were more likely to mistreat their slaves and were harsher masters. A common Jamaican saying reflected the feelings that the slaves preferred white owners. "If me for hava massa or misses, give me Buckra one--no give me mulatto, dem no use neega well (Heuman, 1981, p. 14).

Whatever the explanation or justification for such a situation might be, the result was that these historical practices and attitudes, fashioned a Jamaica in which three distinct groups of people were pitted against each other in a desperate effort to forge a reality and an identity that was neither Europe nor Africa. Phillips (1977) showed the relative position of each group in the following:

> At the pinnacle of Jamaican post-emancipation society there existed a relatively small white plantocratic elite who enjoyed high status and by and large exercised firm control over the economy. At the other end of the scale there existed a large mainly rural, black population devoid of formal political rights and living in impoverished conditions. In between these two strata there was a brown racially mixed group who, while not in a position as prominent as that of the whites, were nonetheless able to achieve some measure of social mobility and enjoyed some measure of political power after emancipation (p. 2).

As the historical process unfolded the whites played out their role and reaped the greater economic benefit, but it would be the Free Coloureds who took their place as the rightful heirs to Britain's legacy of contradictions and psychological chaos. In contemporary Jamaica the descendents of the Free Coloureds are playing out a role--a role prescribed by the dynamics of over three centuries of slave and plantation society. These Free Coloureds were the progenitors of the brown politicians and nation builders who were, above everything else, creoles. This was the group of people committed to the idea of their country as a place where they could come into their own by taking the power away from the colonial office. "They were committed to the country in which they were born and they were dedicated to its future" and for them "this loyalty to Jamaica was in marked contrast to the attitudes of the planter class" (Heuman, 1981, p. 64).

Michael Manley, descending from this caste, inherited the social legacy of privileges along with the vision of commitment to his country's development. His total symbolism to the Jamaican psyche is connected to the meanings and values that characterized the Free Coloureds. In an ex-slave plantation and post-colonial society, the idea of a ruling class gets serious attention both from scholars and from those who are being ruled. The Jamaican society has seen a struggle for such ruling class legitimacy, on several levels. The most obvious has been the one discussed so far, namely, that which existed between the old white planter class and the Free Coloured group. This group was itself land owning and was mostly European trained in the arts and the professions. In this way, they became the native born conscious heirs to the British raj. The case of Jamaica gave the group excellent opportunities for staking its claim since the white settler groups were few in number. Even before emancipation, the Free Coloured class managed to get itself educated, to acquire land and to enter the elected legislature. All these break-throughs came in spite of their relative social isolation from the planter class, and in spite of the recorded attempts to restrict their privileges (Campbell, 1976; Heuman, 1981; Sio, 1976).

Jamaican, native born and native bred the Free Coloureds formed the one group of creoles who had to struggle not only with the 'purity' of Europe but with the 'stain' of Africa in their lineage. Most of them sided with the white power structure and perpetuated the white bias. However, it was from their class that progressive liberal leaders were drawn. Such leaders include Edward Jordan in the 19th century, George William Gordon in the mid-19th century and Norman Washington Manley and Alexander Bustamante between 1938 and 1975.

The pedigree of the group rested on ancestral ties with ownership of the land, with the white race that conquered and dominated on all vital levels, but most critically it rested with the black race that suffered, struggled and survived.

The Manleys, as a family, had all this legacy--and more. Norman Washington Manley, Father of the Jamaican nation was a brilliant barrister, who earned international fame quite early in his career. He was a Rhodes Scholar educated at Oxford. He saw military service with the Imperial (Allied) forces in World War I and won for himself a Military Medal (Nettleford, 1978). He was handsome, debonaire and sophisticated --epitomizing all the strengths of his background. In social and political terms, he married well when he chose Edna Swithenbank, a near white woman of Jamaican and English stock. This woman was willing to admit to and respect her part-African ancestry. This she did through her work and her personal philosophy. As a highly talented artist, she continued the sophistication and glamour associated with the traditional ruling class. At the same time, she did not lose the common touch and the sensibility that drew her closely to the people of the soil. Her desire to retain her roots and to assist in her country's development was given both concrete and abstract expressions in the themes of her work, in the encouragement and access that she gave to artists from the grassroots, and in her appearance in the hustings, by the side of her politician husband.

From the union of Norman and Edna Manley came two sons. The first, Douglas, became a brilliant social anthropologist and university lecturer. The second, Michael, early gained a reputation as a kind of matinee idol--displaying dash and male prowess. Michael's dedication to public service as a journalist and a trade unionist gave him added legitimacy and reinforced his personal appeal. Moreover, the ascendancy to Prime Minister of his father, Norman Manley, gave the family dynastic significance.

This significance impacted on the minds of ordinary and not so ordinary Jamaicans. At last they had their own royal family with all the attributes of a ruling group--power, ancestral pedigree, courage, education, creative talent, social clout as well as the common touch.

The power and the pedigree came from their lineage with the planter class. The show of courage was displayed by Norman Manley in World War I, by Alexander Bustamante as he faced the police and military in the 1938 strikes, and by Michael Manley who served with the Canadian Air Force in World War II. The creative talent peaked in Edna Manley, the sculptress who became the shrine of the artistic community. The social clout was demonstrated by a lifestyle which included horse racing and the salon at Drumblair (the family residence); while the common touch found expression in political commitment, and interests in sports such as track and field and boxing.

In Weberian terms the authority came in the usual three forms and was concentrated and manifested in this one family. Charismatic authority found different levels of expressions in Alexander Bustamante, Norman Manley and Michael Manley. All three of these men made their mark on the society by their role as Prime Minister and by the force of their individual personalities. They were men who had charm and the illusive gift of grace. Traditional authority was to be found in the lineage with the high brown-middle-class, which descended from the Free Coloureds. As the truly indigenous Jamaican, the Manleys are the result of the traumatic meeting of Africa and Europe on foreign soil. Members of the family acquired power and legitimacy through the fight against colonialism, as trade unionists, as Leaders of the Opposition and as Prime Ministers. These posts and responsibilities were held at different times by Alexander Bustamante, Norman Washington Manley, Hugh Shearer and Michael Manley. To date, the family has produced the Founding Fathers of the nation and has enshrined two National Heroes. Thus they were indelibly imprinted on the psyche of the masses. They were the most legitimate heirs of the British legacy of concerns with aristocracy and the meanings and values inherent within this political and social form. The Manleys therefore had the legal-rational base for authority.

Contemporary Jamaican society is a continuing reflection of the power of the descendants of the Free Coloureds and this power is maintained through an intricate networking and overlapping of political and economic influences. Through these influences the group, though numerically small, legitimizes its power base in both concrete and abstract terms. The original Free Coloured group is today reinforced by a sprinkling of whites, Jews and Syrians. They constitute the merchant class, the leaders and decision makers in the banking sector, the owners of the most influential media hours, and the power brokers on all the important Boards of Directors in business, industry and in the most influential public sectors. Reid (1977) gave a full treatment of the kind of all-encompassing influence that this group wields in the Jamaican society. This he discussed in Stone and Brown's (1977) edited work--Essays on Power and Change in Jamaica. He stated:

> The concentration of power and control of the corporate economy lies in the hands of minority ethnic elite and is mainly dispersed through twenty-one families and their interest groups....Implicit in the domination by this small ethnic familial elites of strategic sections of the economy is their continued usurping of the political process and retention of a diffuse but nonetheless real political power (p. 36).

In this discussion the political and economic strength of an elite, steeped in the values of individualism and the value systems that were propagated in the Boarding/Grammar school system that Jamaica inherited from Britain, is demonstrated. Michael Manley, the concretization of all the privileges of his class, had to walk the proverbial tightrope when he declared himself as the people's man.

Powerful Mothers

Much of the literature that has discussed the dynamics of West Indian family life has tended to emphasize the dominant role of the female within the anthropological concept of the matrifocal, especially when the relationships within the peasant and lower class household are being discussed. Edith Clarke's (1957) seminal work on Jamaican family life, My Mother Who Fathered Me, introduced important aspects of the societal and attitudinal factors that must be taken into account in the understanding of family relationships. This work became the focus for much of the subsequent explanations of the workings of the Jamaican family.

In this discussion, I am not purporting to give definitive statements of the gender roles within the Jamaican middle class family. This is an attempt to demonstrate how a series of chance events in a particular socio-cultural milieu came together in a matrix of strong mother figures within one family, to give birth to a unique peronality at a specific point in a society's history.

Michael Manley consciously acknowledges the influence of his mother Edna, on his moral and intellectual development. She becomes the focal point from which the influences of two generations of women can be assessed. It is in Edna Manley's life experiences that the wheel comes full circle. It is she who becomes the mother figure who symbolically gave birth to the Jamaican nation. She is one point of departure for an understanding of the symbolism that Michael Manley had in 1972. Furthermore, the image of Edna Manley looms very large in the Jamaican political arena--giving another dimension to a fuller understanding of Michael Manley and the momentum that he gained from his family lineage. This is especially important, because in concrete terms, Edna Manley is not considered an overt or explicit political figure. On any political platform she is seen in the way many wives of politicians are seen, as supportive and nurturing females always by the side of their men.

Edna Manley takes on a special political significance through her contributions to and her impact on the cultural life of the Jamaican society. Her role as the wife of the Father of the Nation is vital. However, her place by Norman Manley's side was not necessarily the essence of her personal identity, nor was it a measure of the matrix of meanings that she presented to the Jamaican people. In other words, she has her own unique personality and identification. Part of this identification is the mystique that comes from her relationship with the artistic community, nationally and internationally.

Edna Manley was raised in Britain and for all intent and purposes could pass for white. However, her linkages with her Jamaican forebears and the relationship of this to her role as wife of Norman Manley and as mother of Michael Manley strengthened her significance for Jamaica. As one of the daughters of Ellie Swithenbank, she is a descendant of the Jamaican plantocracy, and she is a representative of the group of people, who, in historical terms, formed the Jamaican indigenous aristocracy. Brown (1977) pointed out that:

> to be born into the circle of the island's plantocracy, even at the time when Ellie Swithenbank was born was to have one's material comfort assured. The fabulous centuries were over; the family lived modestly but that is a relative term. The Shearer children (Ellie's family) grew up in a home where black houseboys, nurses, maids and coolies left little to be done (p. 18).

Like most of the people of their background, the daughters of these families gained freedom from the type of work done by the peasants and the poor. In a plantation society they had the freedom to explore their environment and to enjoy the pleasures of the outdoors. Essentially, they were forced to develop a concept of themselves as priviledged and superior to the ones who served them. Additionally, they were not allowed to tap some of the potential and creative energy that are sometimes mobilized in the process of work as it is defined in most societies. Ellie Swithenbank migrated to England in 1897 with her husband who died sometime later. Brown (1977) noted that after her husband's death "an innate strength and tenacity, qualities that in privileged Jamaica she might never had to call on or might never have known, emerged" (p. 37). These qualities enabled Ellie Swithenbank to contribute so well to the development of her daughter's character.

Inherent in this description of one family is a microcosmic analysis of the socio and pyscho-pathology of class as these are discussed by Stennett and Cobbs (1973). In short, the benefits of being the Jamaican ruling class go beyond the concrete benefits related to the economic payoff. They include the internalized values related to a certain sense of freedom which comes from having someone else to take care of all the basic needs. An atmosphere is also created and individuals gain access to a certain lifestyle that comes when one is released from the mundane chores that define the role of both men and women within a household. In this atmosphere the individual has the freedom to pursue more creative and intellectual activities. Conversely, this freedom can also become the bondage that limits the individual's potential. This limitation makes the immigrant experience a liberating force. Indeed, Ellie Swithenbank might not have recognized her strength had she not been forced to confront life without the trappings of a plantation society. Without these trappings, she had to take control of all aspects of her life. The socio-pathology of class is evidenced differently by each strata of class-based societies. Nevertheless, the debilitating consequence of the suppression of human potential has an accumulative quality which affects all classes.

The circumstances which released Ellie Swithenbank's innate potential allowed her to face life in more positive and constructive ways. Her drives, resources, strengths and vision of the future were the building blocks which shaped her household. Edna Manley, therefore, was exposed to an environment created in part by a strong mother figure. It is no accident that she was able to duplicate this role in her own household.

Part and parcel of the legacy of class privileges that the Swithenbanks enjoyed in Jamaica was the internalized views that the plantocracy held both of themselves and of the descendants of the slaves. It is quite obvious from any understanding of slavery and the post slavery era that the white and coloured part of the population were generally contemptuous of the black majority and they had no desire to be associated too closely with them either socially or psychologically. It is therefore not surprising that Edna Manley grew up without knowledge of her black ancestry. This was revealed in one of the notes that cousin Norman Manley wrote to her while he was courting her. In this he suggested that it would not be wise to mention to her mother that she now knows that "she's not pure English" (Brown 1977, p. 93).

As the connection is made between the kind of influence that Edna Manley would eventually have on her son and on Jamaican society, it becomes clear that this woman represents a matrix of creative energy in both the social and psychological sense. One is never quite sure that colour and class are of any importance to her personally. This is because she does not have to confront and enunciate them in the media that were used by both her famous husband and son. She, like other artists, had the unique ability to use her art as the vehicle of social and political commentary. Through this medium she gave testament to the fact that she understood the dreams and aspirations of the black masses.

Thus she removed herself from the direct spotlight of analysis and speculations. Having said that, it is still difficult to ignore the sentiments that she expressed at an earlier time in her life--a time in which she sensed the first stirrings of intimacy that would lead eventually to marriage, and to her re-entry into the Jamaica that gave her a link with her past. Irritated by the covert racism that her cousin and future husband, Norman Manley discussed in his letters to her, she wrote:

> The coloured race can never die ... the coloured race has to go on now--the white people are going to be forced to accept them when they see then developing superior intellects--with fine physiques. It is a race that is beginning--it has enormus possibilities and with a great tendency towards producing that undefinable person--the genius (Brown, 1977, p. 93).

Furthermore, after expounding on the possibility of a super coloured race she placed herself in the centre of the process that would become nation building in the Jamaican political history when she also wrote:

> I want to do my share - towards improving and helping a new race. We are both intelligent and I have great hopes of what our child will be - I don't want him to be white, I want him to have your own beautiful brown skin - and I want him to grown up proud of his race - prouder than any white man and with a character that can't be warped by any amount of ill-treatment - with his mingling of wild blood with the civilized brain of the north - coloured people should be eventually more fit for the fight for life ... I am proud of my mate and proud that somewhere I may have coloured blood in me (Brown, 1977, p. 93).

These sentiments must be understood as the outpourings of youth, of idealism, of sentimentality, of romance, of hope, and of defiance. At the same time, they must be seen as the verbalization of the general themes that many English youth would have been exposed to at the turn of the century. The assumed superiority of English culture and lineage have been captured in the works of all their major writers and thinkers and it would be naive to think that Edna Manley's use of terms such as "wildblood" and "civilized brain" are unique or original. These terms are significant because in Jamaica she would have to recognize the contradictions of class and race. She would also have to confront them within herself and within the society. No one can deny that she has done so in a most eloquent way, and in a way that has prevented anyone from questioning her authenticity as the Mother of the Jamaican Nation.

Support for this view was expressed in Interview #1.[1] This informant maintains that Edna Manley's colour was not an issue because she carved the kinds of work that were very black. She directly confronts the racism within Jamaican society through her created African images and by her role in the artistic community.

> She therefore became a part of the people through the cultural movement and also because of her link with Norman Manley in the political movement.
> (Appendix 1. p.)

Brown (1977) further elaborated on Edna Manley's influence on many of the young men and women who would later play a vital role in independent Jamaica in the following:

> ... artists, writers, journalists, they had this in common - they all had been born in the 20th century, many since the war and had come and were coming to maturity in a political climate that, the world over, increasingly favoured the spread of nationalism. At Drumblair, among other places, they grew used to meeting older public spirited men and a strange group of young English women (p. 238).

The relationship that developed between Edna Manley and the

---

[1] The interview is recorded in the appendix. At this point, the interview material is being used to substantiate the argument.

Jamaican artistic community had a direct impact on both the political carrers of her husband, Norman, and her son, Michael. By Norman's side during the early struggles of 1938, and the later processes that saw the realization of universal adult sufferage, the formation of the two party system, and the eventual independence from colonial rule, Edna Manley symbolically represented the coming together of diverse racial and political strains. By establishing her own identity and by expressing her belief in the struggles of the black Jamaican through her art forms, she neutralized any personal attacks on her obvious white skin and Caucasian features. In societies such as Jamaica, race and colour become the base line when all else fail and the overlap between colour and class has much relevance to any kind of political and social movement even in the 1980's.

By legitimizing herself, Edna Manley became an acceptable mother image for the nation. This image must be understood beyond her role as the wife of Norman Manley the Father of the Nation. Edna Manley needed to go beyond being the wife of Norman Manley in order to become the Mother of the Nation. She needed to demonstrate her understanding of the dreams and aspirations of the Jamaican black masses and also to show that in this process she was her own unique person. In this evolution of her personal philsophy, Edna Manley had a direct and powerful impact on the men in her life. Her influence on husband Norman was "manifest in the almost puritanical simplicity of his tastes, his habit of unremitting hard work, his rejection of material well-being as the end of life, his stubborn independence and an almost compulsive self discipline" (Sherlock, 1980, p. 50).

Intrinsic within this kind of influence is the suggestion that

Norman Manley had a deep need to be mothered or to be transformed. Perhaps Edna continued the linkage that he had with a mother who mirrored all positive attributes that he needed to motivate him in his search for excellence and fulfillment. Sherlock (1980) records that Norman Manley lost his mother when he was only sixteen but her faith in his future and the encouragement that she gave to him while she lived was enough to propel him to the greatest heights in his society.

> "Her dreams guided him ... and through the strength and faith of his mother his feet were set on the road of the privileged in the colonial society of the day" (pp. 54-55).

Sherlock (1980) also demonstrates that, like the majority of youth in the Jamaican society, Norman Manley was influenced by a mother who was forced by circumstances to play a dual role in her family:

> The compelling influence of his mother remained with him. His father had died when he was five, so that she was both father and mother to him until she too died ... his own personal desire to excel was reinforced by a determination to justify her faith in him (p. 56).

His mother's faith in him found its psychological linkage to the kind of person that Edna Manley was. Edna's skills and attitudes complimented his strengths and she firmly knotted th familial bonds of two generations of strong mothers. In this process she fulfilled the mandate that was given by Norman's mother. In a letter, her sister-in-law Vera (Norman's sister) expressed the sentiments that Norman was expected to become an outstanding figure in Jamaican life. In reference to the influence of their mother she wrote:

> After all we cannot have had one most exceptional mother for nothing--she had all the strength of character your own mother has with a sympathetic soul and most charming manner. A woman can do a lot for a man in Jamaica, especially a coloured--although there is little or no prejudice in that Island in the Sun and you had training in England (Brown, 1977, p. 104).

In this compact statement the role of the woman who is near white or white is illustrated. Also the value placed on the symbolism of European forms in Jamaican society is enunciated. The statement further emphasizes the relative value of the man of colour versus the woman who is either white or can pass for white. This complex of contradictions and social reality is embedded in a history that has negated the viability of the masses of the people. Edna Manley therefore, had to grapple with, her meanings as a woman, as a mother and as a thinker. In her role and meaning as a mother, she continued the tradition of positive female influence. In her meaning as woman and thinker, she had a great impact on her son Michael, who like his father Norman became Prime Minister of Jamaica.

Michael Manley links his passions for social justice, fair play and equality partly to his mother's influence. He described her as a:

> profoundly instinctive egalitarian who gave people of all walks of life access to her affections, her verandah, her conversation and her gifts--and she never ever intended to live within a class and then reach out with condescending charity to another class"
>
> (See Chapter 6, p. 160)

This is a most fitting tribute to any mother, and, in the Jamaican context, it is a powerful testimony to Edna Manley who has successfully carved a personal power against all the historical and psychological backlog of race and class contradictions. Edna Manley is therefore, crucial to Michael Manley's charisma. She is a powerful and reinforcing agent behind the scene. Comments from the interviews typified by the following are very revealing. This is the response of a close female family member:

> She does not come to him, he goes to her, there is no doubt about that
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 379)

An opposition Member of Parliament makes this statement:

> He is a mother's boy, he runs home, shadows under his mother and I don't know if he gets love at home but he demonstrates a passion of love for his mother
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 336)

Another family member makes this comment:

> There is a genuinely close relationship between Michael and his mother
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 393)

These observations are instructive of the dynamic influence that Edna Manley had on the Jamaican psyche. Her son, Michael, embodies her energies and her vision of the genius that the Jamaican society needed. At the same time, he moved the struggle of the masses beyond the dreams of both his mother and father.

Michael Manley gave to the Jamaican political life, a climate in which the most controversial and contradictory forces had to surface and be confronted. Issues of class inequalities, racial prejudice, economic imbalances and a variety of cultural practices, had to be addressed. In this process, he helped the Jamaican electorate to take a look at the disparate historical forces that have retarded progress, and blurred the horizons of hope for the nation.

An Illustrious Father

Norman Washington Manley, like his wife Edna, have the same roots and lineage within the Jamaican society. Brown (1977) tells us that Norman's father, Albert Samuel Manley, "was a coloured produce dealer, the illegitimate son of a Yorkshireman and a black Jamaican woman. In marrying him, Margaret Shearer, Ellie's sister (Edna's aunt) lost virtually all her friends" (p. 62). These facts highlight the value system that developed amongst the Coloureds. They also show how this system would affect individuals from time to time.

Norman Manley, though less charismatic than his son Michael, was one of the earlier politicians whose personal attributes and world view filled the need of the Jamaican masses to be led by someone who either has or appears to have some elusive god-like quality. During his long and memorable term as politician, statesman and Prime Minister, "many demanded from him consistency in excellence of performance. He hardly dared to be human" (Nettleford, 1971, p. xii). An analysis of his development and actions shows that charisma characterized partly by the cult of the personality, did not come naturally to Norman Manley. He was perhaps too calculating, too goal and task oriented, or too driven by his mother's vision of what he ought to be. He didn't spontaneously exhibit that earthy dynamism which seems to be an essential ingredient in the political life of Third World countries. However, as Nettleford (1971) argues, "those to whom charisma does not come naturally must find ways and means of developing the divine gift of political grace so as to ensure credibility and legitimacy" (p. xiii).

Norman Manley gained currency in the Jamaican society of his time by his personal achievements and by the image that he projected--astute advocate, eloquent speaker, super intellectual and worthy (though aloof) mediator/leader. These were some of the attributes that set the stage for the labels that were appropriate to his style and relevant to the times. The labels include Father of the Nation, Man of Destiny, and the Man With the Plan. Nettleford's (1971) contention that such slogans might be regarded as gross aberrations which might have done the modest and erstwhile unassertive Manley and his cause more harm than good, perhaps places too much emphasis on Norman Manley's personal feelings and sensitivities. Rather than being aberrations, the slogans were appropriate because Norman Manley's was the kind of leader image that the nation needed at a time when the passion for independence from the colonial office was being satisfied. It was a time of renewal, a time when a new nation was being born, and Jamaicans steeped in a tradition of slavery and dependence, needed, in a symbolic sense, to be legitimately fathered. Given a choice, within this symbolic frame, all the mothers would like to bear sons who would be like him.

In this context Nettleford (1971) came to the more reasonable conclusion that Norman Manley could not escape the messianic demands made of leaders in Jamaica. In fact, Norman was well prepared to satisfy the psychological needs of his society. His early achievement as a schoolboy athlete, a Rhodes Scholar, a brave soldier and a brilliant lawyer set the pace for the political stature he eventually achieved, both nationally and internationally. Like his wife Edna, he believed that out of a history of colonization, cross-breeding and cross-fertilization of cultures and races came a people with a great creative potential and much energy. This sentiment is captured in Norman Manley's description of his countrymen:

> Out of the past of fire and suffering and neglect the human spirit has survived patient and strong, quick to anger, quick to forgive, lusty and vigorous but with deep reserves of loyalty and love, and a deep capacity of steadiness under stress, and for joy in all that makes life good and blessed (Nettleford, 1971, p. xix).

Given the social and economic realities of colonial Jamaica, Norman Manley was somewhat of an idealist who used his own life history and experiences as the blueprint of the Jamaican people. Surely, he could not have been face to face with the frustrations that manifested themselves so starkly in the later era that called on his son to be the Messiah, not only with words, but with actions. Norman Manley, in this sense, was a typical product of his class and upbringing. He initially saw Jamaica from his place in society. Not having to face the starkest realities of poverty and racism, he apprehended life at a level of idealism--an idealism that fired his vision for change which in turn gave his people a hope for redemption.

The Father's Legacy of Ideas

In order to trace the historical links of political thought and action between Michael Manley and his father, the belief system of Norman Manley must be understood. It would be irresponsible to assume that Michael's socialization within his family structure did not influence his later political stance.

Nettleford (1971) saw modernization and development as the two key concepts of Norman Manley's vision of Jamaica's political life. Norman Manley recognized that these processes could only be effected in a society that had a broad base of support, and he successfully campaigned for Universal Sufferage, which came to the Jamaican people in 1944. The vote was a very concrete response to a people, the majority of whom had been kept out of the decision making processes of their society. Norman Manley openly encouraged more people to be active participants in their own destinies. It can be argued that this participation was merely an illusion because the relative power relationships between the established classes were not affected by the vote. Be that as it may, the masses, in the late forties realized that for the first time they were given a tool that had great potential for change. They readily caught the vision of self-government and freedom from the colonial yoke. Thus Norman Manley proved that he could deliver some concrete aspects of the promise that he held out to his people. According to Nettleford (1971) the major and guiding political themes of Norman Manley's regime were the idea of organized politics, the two party system, the independence of labour and politics, self-determination and socialism.

The idea of organized politics was loosely represented in the Jamaican society by the earlier efforts to form pressure groups in opposition to the colonial office. These attempts were fomented and organized by men like Marcus Garvey and W.A. Domingo, whose legacy to the political development of the Jamaican people has been duly recorded and recognized. Marcus Garvey is now one of Jamaica's National Heroes. Norman Manley's founding of the People's National Party (PNP) represented "the triumph of the idea of organized politics over the unstructured and ineffective arrangements which characterized Jamaican politics since he was a boy" (Nettleford, 1971, p. xxix).

A Charismatic Cousin

The formation of the PNP also set the framework for Norman Manley's cousin, Alexander Bustamante, who formed the opposing Jamaican Labour Party (JLP). Bustamante's presence, charismatic personality and overt identification with the masses moved the arena of conflict from the colonial office against the local nationalists, to a confrontation between two factions led by two local sons. In fact, Norman Manley's political actions and development cannot be fully discussed without an appreciation of the personality of Alexander Bustamante, who proved a strong and formidable opponent at the ballot box over a period of ten to fifteen years. The cross-fertilization of ideas, values and belief systems of these men are crucial to an understanding of contemporary Jamaican politics. Both Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante constituted the crucible which gave birth to Michael Manley.

In Jamaica (Circa, 1938) the yearning for a Messiah had "found its object in that eccentric traveller with his self-created surname and past. Bustamante, fair skinned, tall and hawkishly handsome, volatile, charismatic and "unreconstructed egotist" was the man for the depressed and strive torn island" (Brown, 1977, p. 246). Bustamante gained political prominence against the labour unrests and the strikes of the sugar, banana and dock workers in 1938. In leading the strikers in demonstrations and in uniting them with the rhetoric and action which led to his arrest, he paved a path to the hearts of the working class. Norris (1962) described him as:

> An adventurer appearing out of the blue to lead the toiling multitude, he was the charismatic leader of all charismatic leaders. With his towering stature, wild hair, striking features and high-pitched voice, he combined a historic flamboyance with a rare understanding of the bread and butter issues which went straight to the worker's heart (p. 20).

The arrest of Bustamante for these activities was important to Norman Manley who interceded for his release, and stood by his side throughout the long period of negotiations on behalf of the workers. Together, they completed the dual image of their people's needs--the man of the people, and the great intellect. They forged a bond that would later confuse and blur the real issues on the one hand, but would, on the other, create the climate of conflict that was necessary for change.

The generation and resolution of conflict is a necessary ingredient in political development. The opposition posed to Norman Manley by Alexander Bustamante, strengthened party notions and enhanced the themes of the two party/bipartisan system.

Nettleford (1971) maintains that Bustamante did not necessarily believe in a two party system. According to Nettleford (1971) Bustamante saw his power base amongst the newly enfranchised masses and believed that with the power of the vote, the PNP and Norman Manley would soon disappear from the scene. Norman Manley, on the other hand, recognized that an opposition party was necessary to a democratic society. He also realized that "the remarkable Bustamante was not to be destroyed but to be contained and defeated on his own terms--through gaining the support and affecting the organization of the masses" (Nettleford, 1971, p. xxxii). The struggles to gain the affection of the masses by both parties was the beginning of the blurring of any ideological differences between the two major political parties that would eventually dominate the Jamaican scene.

Norman Manley's own political views facilitated this blurring of ideological lines. He had pledged to give Jamaica to the Jamaicans and free his people from colonial bondage. Bustamante was as Jamaican as Manley was, therefore, he had to be seen as a legitimate and possible leader. Besides this commitment, Norman Manley also sensed that the two parties could not afford to be so far apart that the arena of conflict could be broadened and so polarized that one party could eventually be eliminated. Opposition in these terms can be analysed as partly for the sake of the opposition and partly as a means of control and balance in thought and action. It can also be seen as a subtle tool for the use of the ruling class in the maintenance of its relative position and in the protection of its interests. Beckford and Witter (1980) argued that the colonial office accepted the leadership of Bustamante and Manley so that the mulatto class could continue to dominate. This dominating class, besides being the bearers of the kinds of values and attitudes that would perpetuate the colonial influences, also served as the social buffer zone between the dispossessed blacks and the ruling white and near white Jamaicans and Europeans.

The fact that both parties showed an early convergence of aims and purposes is significant. It demonstrates that they wished to protect and maintain the status quo. It also laid the basic framework for the easy radicalization of either of the two which might choose to move to the left or to the right, in the future. Michael Manley's greater leanings towards the left in the seventies proved to be a sufficient departure from the ideological base of either his father's or Bustamante's party. This is not to say that Norman Manley did not see the PNP as ideologically different from the JLP. He advocated socialism as the best means of gaining individual freedom through collective responsibility. Conversely, he saw the free enterprise pursuits of the JLP as an extension of the colonial heritage and maintenance of the boss class. Ideology aside, like all astute politicians, he knew that in a two party system "one party constantly accepts, borrows or steals the ideas, plans or the accomplishments of the other" (Nettleford, 1971, p. xxiv).

As the Jamaican electorate voted for or against one party over time, there developed an awareness that in the process of protecting the ruling class interests, the ideological differences between the parties had to be minimal. It is interesting to note that when political parties are not clearly distinguishable in their ideology, the voters rely on the personality of the leaders to influence their decisions at the polls. Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante provided the most perfect prototype of a duo whose destinies were closely hinged to the images that each could project and maintain at any particular time in their career. Beckford and Witter (1980) perceived the JLP as a party that maintained mass support not because of its programmes or its ability to deliver the goods, but because of Bustamante's charisma and "roots-ness". His particular brand of "roots-ness" was demonstrated in his style, language and general deportment. This is in accord with Norris's (1962) argument that Bustamante did nothing to shake his saviour image. According to Norris (1962) he subtly appealed to the psychological needs of the masses by a rhetoric that did not go above their heads.

> His physical stature and exploits, both subjects of uninhibited boasting, inspired the confidence of a timid people schooled in the concept of superhuman deliverence. A people who had suffered in silence for generations were drawn out of their shell and found courage to rebel (p. 22).

Norman Manley's appeal was not to the level of roots, but to the idealized self. He epitomized what a fine Jamaican gentleman should be and he gave everyone hope of becoming like the white man though not white. Undoubtedly, this image had a greater appeal to the middle classes and the intellectual elite. At the same time he went beyond his in-class appeal because he represented the ultimate in abstract development to the poor and uneducated. The rivalry between Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante can be seen either as the result of the colonial divide and rule strategy, or as the result of the psychological need of the Jamaican people to have both images of themselves fulfilled. Both Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante embodied aspects of a duality within the Jamaican psyche. By the beginning of the sixties both political parties, according to Nettleford (1971), were indistinguishable in the background of their leaders, in their ideological commitment, in their funding sources and in the policies that they were prepared to implement. The gaining of Independence from the colonial office in 1962 must be seen against this political backdrop because this lack of perceived differences would have to be addressed by the leaders who take over these parties in the future.

The foregoing was part of the legacy that was passed on to Michael Manley when he took the reins of leadership of the PNP, the party conceived and birthed by his illustrious father. Along with the ideological and conceptual framework of the PNP, Michael Manley inherited a formalized party machinery. He also inherited a party that was based on multiclass support, but most extensively, a party supported by the middle-class and a party whose leader and founder epitomized the dreams and aspirations of that particular class.

Michael Manley had to forge for himself an identity distinct from that of a superbly outstanding father, Norman Manley, and a charismatic relative, Alexander Bustamante. In this process he had to incorporate aspects of both men and then move beyond them in order to carve his own niche in Jamaica's political history.

The Search for Redemption

The search for a leader who would hold out hope for redemption to the oppressed black masses of the Jamaican society has had a long colourful history in the country's political development. This search is understandable against the background of an ex-slave and plantation society. This society has evolved into one that manifests both the strengths and weaknesses of all post-colonial societies.

Patterson's (1973) Sociology of Slavery, William's (1964) Capitalism and Slavery, James (1963) Black Jacobins, Nettleford's (1971) Mirror, Mirror, Nettleford's (1978) Caribbean Cultural Identity, and Mais' (1979) Brother Man are examples of scholarly works which captured and developed the themes of oppression, suffering, economic distortions, social and psychological dislocations and the attempts at redemption through a variety of processes, philosophies and personalities. Patterson's (1973) work, typifying the general appraisal of the dynamics of a slave society, made the point that the conditions and relationships of the slave era were not accepted by or acceptable to the slaves, and they consistently attempted to throw off their yoke of oppression. If the climate of resistance was triggered by an intrinsic need for freedom it was bolstered by the structural and economic state of slave society. Patterson (1973) argues that:

> In one form or the other the slave expressed his resentment of his lot sometimes in covert, indirect and relatively mild manners, at other times in direct revolt against the object of his oppression (p. 260).

This resentment took two forms of resistance--a passive one (refusal to work, satire, physical escape and suicide), and an active one (individual and collective violence) Patterson (1973) chronicled the intensity of the Maroon[1] guerilla warfare and the impact of the many slave rebellions in which hundreds of persons were killed. These incidents were recorded between 1655 when the British captured Jamaica, and 1832 two years before emancipation of the slaves (Patterson, 1973). Resistance, both passive and violence was a historical feature of the Jamaican society. Patterson (1973) deduced that with the possible exception of Brazil no other slave society in the New World experienced so much continuous and intense resistance against the conditions and institutions of slavery. This spirit of rebellion in the Jamaican people did not dissipate with the abolition of the slave trade nor did it cease with the eventual emancipation of the slaves. This is because these events did not alter the essential nature of the relationship within the society. The subsequent economic hardships that textured the lives of the descendants of the slaves, created an environment in which the struggle to be free of oppression would continue to take form, in a variety of ways and through a number of institutions.

The continuing search for redemption by the Jamaican people falls within the general framework typfied by the discussion on messianic cults and millenarian movements. The area of overlap between religious and political energies is highly developed and well documented within Jamaican social history. Both Norris (1962) and Patterson (1973) commented on the fact that the religious energies of the African heritage was adapted to the doctrines of the Christian sects. These sects tried to influence the slave population in much the same way that Northrop

---

[1] When the British captured Jamaica in 1655, the Spaniards fled to Cuba. The African slaves of the Spaniards fled to the hills and resisted the English. These runaway slaves were called Maroons.

(1947) discussed the adaptation of the Latin American indigenous traditions to the beliefs of Roman Catholicism. In Jamaica, African beliefs and rituals showed early manifestations of adaptation in the formalized, though secret practises of obeah and myalism.[1] Cashmore (1979) points out tht "some features of the obeah-myal complex were found to be intriguingly compatible with those of christianity" (p. 16).

For a long time the African practices were more important to the slaves than the teachings of the orthodox Christian churches. According to Patterson (1973) groups such as the Moravians, Methodists and Baptists were committed to saving the souls of the slaves, had only a superficial impact on the population. He argued that their greatest role in the search for redemption was the stimulation of the African religious base. This base laid the foundation for modern Jamaican Revivalism, and plotted the path for the continuing messianic search through religious endeavours and political movements.

The merging of the generalized religiosity of the society with the dreams of liberation brought to the historical process the Tacky Rebellion of 1760 which was inspired by an obeah man; the pre-emancipation rebellion led by the native Baptist leader Samuel Sharpe; and the Morant Bay Rebellion of 1865 which projected the personalities of the brown landowner George William Gordon and the black preacher Paul Bogle (Patterson, 1973). All of these events and leaders demonstrated to the power structure that the apprehension of evil, in religious terms, can move quickly beyond the passive response of subjugation to a higher being. It can move to the active level of transferring the

[1] See definition of terms in Chapter 1.

essence of liberation inherent in the religious teachings to the struggles for freedom and human dignity. By so doing the apprehension of evil can be realized in the secular arena of armed struggle.

Complementing and continuing the struggle that erupted in violent confrontation were the movements and personalities that have fed into the contemporary political climate. Of relevance to this was the visionary Alexander Bedward described by Cashmore (1979) as:

> a Native Baptist leader who turned his local following into a full fledged millenarian movement. Bedward created his somewhat unexceptional Baptist Free Church in 1895 at August Town where he cultivated a reputation on the basis of his alleged healing powers ... At the turn of the century, he introduced a somewhat startling dimension into his hitherto conventional Native Baptism. He told his followers of an impending holocaust in which all the whites would be destroyed and the blacks redeemed (p. 19).

Bedward's political significance laid not in his delusions that he was the reincarnated Jesus Christ nor in the fact that he tried to convince his followers that he could physically ascend into the heavens. It laid in the inherent messages that he had for the black masses. The Jamaican colonial authorities charged him with sedition for the following pronouncement recorded by Sherlock (1980):

> Brethren, hell will be your portion if you do not rise up and crush the white man ... There is a white wall and a black wall but now the black wall is becoming bigger than the white and we must knock the white wall down. The white wall has oppressed us for years (p. 35).

Bedward was seen as a potential danger by the colonial office and by the local authorities because he had the ability to inspire his followers in religious and mellenarian terms. Furthermore, he inspired them in political terms by helping them to voice in strident terms the nature and source of their oppression. The voicing of this oppression was a signal to the authorities that the masses, under the right leader, could be a potential threat to the power brokers of the society. Indeed, as Alves (1969) so eloquently states:

> Man's language is a mirror of his historicity. It not only emerges out of the metabolism which goes on between him and his world but is uttered as a response to the concrete situations in which he finds himself. It is obvious that language is not always the expression of man's historicity. Very often it is just a set of symbols which function as a shorthand way of picturing the behavior of nature or which simply describes what has objectively happened ... When language is historical, however, it tells man's story. It does not simply describe. It contains man's interpretation of the message and challenge that his world addresses to him and expresses man's responses to this message and challenge (p. 4).

Bedward's world, as it was experienced in Jamaica at the turn of the century, expressed the state of the black masses and challenged him to put into words his understanding of their reality. In this he was not alone, nor would he be the most significant person to voice the longings of his people.

Marcus Garvey, Bedward's contemporary, was to become the Moses of the movement that sought to return dignity to the Jamaican black person by the reaffirmation of the physical and psychological link to the African continent. Garvey is described by Cashmore (1979) as a native of Jamaica for whom:

> ...the evil system of European colonialism had fragmented the Africans and dispersed them throughout the globe in places where they could not fully express themselves intellectually and culturally. Not only had blacks been physically suppressed but their consciousness had been stunted and they had lost the sense of pride and dignity in being black. The restoration of this lost pride was to be brought about by a complete rupture with the white world and the return of blacks to Africa (p. 20).

In his mission to spread the idea of redemption to other blacks in the disapora, Garvey moved from his native Jamaica to the United

States and intensely pursued his vision of African redemption, through the return of dignity to the descendants of the slaves. Sherlock (1980) maintains that in this effort Garvey "gave blackness a new dynamic personality, animated the majority of the people with hope and confidence and kindled their interest in changing their condition through organized political activity" (p. 45).

Marcus Garvey (1887 - 1940), Jamaica's celebrated black prophet and national hero, looms above all the visionaries and activists, past and present, because he unapologetically confronted the racism and negation of the African presence in Jamaica. When he was unable to work effectively in his native land he migrated to the United States and founded the Universal Negro Improvement Association. The difficulties that would accompany his search for freedom and the return of dignity to his fellow Jamaicans were anticipated in his 1916 letter to Major Robert R. Morton of the Tuskegee Industrial Institute. Chronicling the economic and psychological consequences of class and colour in the Jamaican society, Garvey presents to Major Morton, his basic philosophy on the question of race and racial concerns in the following:

> Racial ideals do no people harm, therefore, the Jamaican Negro has done himself a harm in not thinking on racial ideals with the scattered Negroes of other climes. The coloured and white population have been thinking and planning on exclusive race ideas--race ideas which are unwritten and unspoken. The diplomacy of one race or class of people is the means by which others are outdone, hence the diplomacy of the other races prevent them leading the race question in Jamaica, a question that could have been understood and regarded without friction (Lowenthal and Comitas, 1973, p. 5).

Garvey's belief in the positive force of racial ideals informed his rhetoric. He emphasized the need for black Jamaicans to look to

Africa for the source of their redemption (both physical and psychological). Garvey's vision became the guiding light for the ideological foundations of the Rastafarian movement.

The Rastafarian Legacy

This movement has been described by many scholars as one that is more than a messianic cult. Guided by the inspiration of Garvey's ideas, and confronted with the concrete realities of the poverty stricken urban slum dwellers of Western Kingston, the Rastafarians looked externally for redemption. As early as the 1930's, they looked to Africa and to Haile Selassie, the former Emperor of Ethiopia, for the source of their spiritual redemption. The oppressive conditions of the Jamaican society were defined within the framework of the motifs rooted in the Old Testament accounts of the Judaic exile. In this framework the Rastafarian philosophy epitomized the merging of religiosity and political endeavors and typified the evolution of a revolutionary force from a base that was tinged with biblical symbolism. Nettleford (1971) pointed out that for the Rastafarians the redemption dynamic:

> ....is rooted in the Bible. The Scattering, the Exile and the Return are all recorded and prophesied in the Old Testament. Each year brings hopes of the 'millenium' when fulfillment will be realized in 'repatriation' to the black man's vine and fig tree, Ethiopia (p. 66).

Since its earliest formulations, the Rastafarian Movement has adapted its spiritual and inspirational commitment to the ideals of Garveyism and physical repatriation to Africa. In so doing they have moved beyond the idea of redemption on an external plane to the notion of the apprehension of the social and psychological evils within their society. Rastafarianism, therefore, evolved into a movement that eventually had impact on the youth of the ghettos, and on the socially aware intelligensia of the University of the West Indies. By extension, it influenced the sons and daughters of the middle class and became deeply involved with the Jamaican society. In Nettleford's (1971) terms, Rastafarianism became:

> ... the barometer of social and economic pressures in the society chiefly among that segment of the population which has long nurtured a feeling of having been wronged and deprived. Supported by a continuous state of economic want and social humiliation the masses threw up the Rastafari who reinforced their moral position by a strongly religious dynamic giving their movement a momentum and force which was easily conceived as a threat to the society it sought to change. For implicit in the rejection of the dominant values and beliefs of the society was a desire for fundamental change (p. 100).

The desire for fundamental change was voiced in a variety of ways by the members, supporters and interpretors of the Rastafarian Movements. All responded to a painfully felt sense of exile that has been indelibly imprinted on the psyche of a once enslaved people. This sense of exile was transmitted across generations and was nurtured by the unequal distribution of social and economic privilleges. It became the protest theme of the youth and the dispossessed, in a society where the stark realities of poverty and underdevelopment of the majority are stridently contrasted with the affluence and power of the few.

In 1972, Michael Manley was adequately prepared to wear the mantle of the personalities that preceded him. He was the offspring of powerful parents and he had direct lineage with one very charismatic leader. He came with a long tradition of a family with dynastic overtones, to a people who have never let up in their search for some redemption force (either through religious/political movements or through messianic leaders). It was, therefore, not surprising that Michael Manley's left leaning ideology of Democratic Socialism dovetailed with the dominant themes of the cult atmosphere that had permeated the Jamaican society. His political campaign was also greatly enhanced by the spirit and actions of the Rastafarian movement.

Essentially, Michael Manley's adherence to the notions of equality and justice within Democratic Socialism, was compatible with the Rastafarian world view. As Nettleford (1978) argued:

> The divinity of all men and the objectives of peace and love are sound enough moral bases for the political aspirations to such ideals as equality and social justice. The force of the contemporary spirit of authenticity is second only to the ancestral cultural goods to be found among the sturdy peasantry on the hillsides and in the valleys of rural Jamaica (p. 65).

In a similar vein the broad philosophical outlook of the Rastafarian movement accomodated to both the abstract/symbolic and the concrete levels of Michael Manley's ideological framework. For instance, Nettleford (1978) noted how these symbolic expressions of the Rastafari were realized in concrete terms. He pointed out that one of the distinguishing features of the Rastafarian person is the long and carefully unkempt hair. This was complemented by the wearing of a bright garb believed to be African. This style of dress and appearance stood in stark contrast to the appearance of the rest of the population. This breaking with the dress code was also promoted by the Michael Manley's regime. During his term in office, the wearing of the kareba or bush jac, became acceptable and stylish even on the most formal occasions.

Nettleford (1978) also noted that the Rastafarian's unashamed commitment to their African past, and the use of the descriptor black as a reference to self, were important to the development of PNP rhetoric during the 1970's. Through songs and the reggae music made popular by the Rastafarians such as Bob Marley and Peter Tosh, the Jamaican youth expressed the wrath that they felt. In the process, new linguistic forms arose, and the language of the Jamaican folk adapted to the Rastafarian world view. Because of this, many Rastafarian words and phrases were used by people in all classes, to express their feelings about their society.

Summary

The masses of the Jamaican people have sought redemption from the oppressive conditions of their society, in a variety of ways. This constant search has taken the form of either passive or active resistance. It has also caused movements and outstanding personalities to come forward in the long historical process of political development. All such movements and persons have had a lasting impact on the Jamaican society.

The Rastafarian movement inspired by the visions of Marcus Garvey, managed to make such an impact on the political process of their country. In doing so, they challenged the traditional value systems of the Jamaican society. They also forced the ruling class to recognize and incorporate aspects of Rastafarian philosophy into their political platform. This impact on the political process was most evident in the seventies. The seventies was the period in which the political fortunes of Michael Manley were realized. These fortunes were enhanced by the contriburions of the Rastafarian musical themes, linguistic nuances, religiosity and their general world view. Michael Manley's political fortunes, were, therefore, inextricably linked to the long history of resistance that has characterized Jamaica's socio-political development.

Joshua in Babylon: An Analysis of Image Making in Jamaica.

In the dramatic arena of Jamaican political life, many incidents make vivid the mystification and practical application of abstract ideas. The 1972 election campaign was a good example of how ideas can take on a life of their own. This campaign demonstrated how Michael Manley was transformed into a magical figure - the Joshua, who would liberate his people and give them freedom from economic and social oppression. Joshua in the Judeo-Christian biblical account is the liberator who caused the walls of Jericho to fall down. This account was symbolically translated into the Jamaican setting and took on concrete reference in the person of Michael Manley. During the 1972 Jamaican general elections, Michael Manley became a Joshua partly because of the historical moment and partly because of his unique personal attributes. These were embodied in the complex of meanings that have been discussed so far. As Bertrand Russell (1938) pointed out:

> sometimes an age appears in history through its prominent individuals and derives its apparent character from the characters of these men (p. 29).

According to Barrett (1977), Jamaica, the Babylon of the Rastafarians "is a land of oppression. The only avenue of escape is by supernatural means or by seizing power and creating an utopia for the oppressed" (p. 3). By the early 1970's Babylon desperately needed a liberator--a Joshua figure to remove the walls of economic and social oppression. The power brokers within the PNP captured the mood of the times and in a very organized and deliberate way created a Jamaican Joshua.

This creation was not a one sided effort. Michael Manley was not the passive recipient of an image, especially one of such noble proportions. He was as actively involved in the process as his supporters were. His personal style, his ego needs and his stature within his society provided the opportunity for his followers to invest their emotional need in a redemptive figure. An image can only be created by the active participation of the two sides of the image making--the individual who embodies the image, and those who recognize the utility of the image. It is therefore a dialetical process in which the ego needs and potential of the individual dovetail with the needs of the times or of groups and other individuals.

Joshua, in the biblical account was no mere flesh and blood human. He was indeed an individual who embodied a mystical component. He did not use battering rams to beat down the walls of Jericho. He blew his trumpet and the walls came tumbling down. This was a clear indication that he used a strategy that made political and military gains because he understood both the times and the people that he led and those whom he struggled against. In 1972, the Jamaican Joshua had also to embody a mystique that moved him beyond the realms of ordinary men. This mystique was rooted in the social history of a people who have sought redemption through a variety of approaches. These approaches include slave rebellions, religious awakenings, legislative processes, nationalism, black nationalism, cults and political parties. A number of these typify the responses of people who have had to deal with the symbolic rather than the substantive meanings of things, actions and individuals.

Lindsay (1975) argued that the PNP had a tradition of catering in part to the symbolic and to the mystical, to form as opposed to substance. He made this point in his discussion of the formation and ideology of the party by positing that it was structured around the extent to which men such as Florizel Glasspole, Norman Manley and other stalwarts of the party could use their Afro-Saxon command over the symbols and substance of British culture to mystify and mesmerize ordinary Jamaican citizens into accepting the party's competence to govern. Lindsay (1975) also argued that Joshua was an extension of this tradition, in that, historically within the PNP:

> left wing feelings of political self-inadequacy led to the conscious decision to nurture and project a super heroic image of Norman Manley as the great upper status intellectual savior who had descended from above to rescue and redeem the Jamaican masses from their supposed stupidity and foolhardiness (p. 32).

It is within this tradition and psycho-social framework that the image makers of the seventies identified a concrete object that would embody a certain degree of mysticism. This object was a wooden rod which Michael Manley carried to political mass meetings. This rod was supposedly introduced to the party supporters as a gift from Haile Selassie, the former Emperor of Ethiopia. This object, therefore, became the medium for very complex and multifaceted messages. These messages offered the promise of economic betterment while they addressed the psychological needs of a people who had survived centuries of oppression and unequal treatment. Inherent within this complex of meanings were the broader issues of the search for identity, the reaffirmation of the dominant African presence within the Jamaican society, the economic disparities determined by class and caste and the interrelationship of social, political and economic issues, nationally and internationally.

This process of conveying a complex of meanings through the use of an object is explained succinctly by Blumer's (1969) discussion of symbolic interactionism as resting on three premises. Blumer (1969) argued that human beings act towards things on the basis of the meanings that these things have for them. He further stated that the meanings of such things derive from and arise out of social interactions between individuals and groups in any society. Furthermore, individuals use these meanings through an interpretative process when they encounter the things. In this framework, the very nature of an object can be seen as related to the meanings that it can have for a person or a group of persons. Because of socio-historical experiences and psychological needs, the same object can have a different meaning at a different point in time for the same people. The important connection is that which is made when an object can take on a mutual set of understandings and become a focus for a variety of persons.

The rod of the Jamaican Joshua was not an anonymous length of wood. It was promoted as a gift given to Michael Manley by Haile Selassie. The symbolism of Haile Selassie and the relationship of this with the Rastafarian movement, enhanced the meanings of the rod. This object was capable of assisting Joshua to address the fundamental issues of identity, economic disparities, class injuries and other social problems. In this process, the rod assisted Michael Manley's transformation into a Joshua because it gave him a way of symbolically projecting the possibility of change in the future.

A Joshua for the People

The People's National Party launched its 1972 campaign at a mass meeting in Montego Bay. The Daily Gleaner which is a national and independent newspaper described the event in the following words: "With the rain gone, the crowd shouted. 'We want Joshua! We want Joshua!' until Mr. Manley appeared with a rod in hand, to address them" (7/2/72).

During this address Michael Manley masterfully demonstrated the concretization of abstractions in a way that was psychologically satisfying to the masses. For instance, he turned his attention to the lifestyle of the ministers of the government of the day (the JLP) and he questioned the source of their apparent wealth and conspicuous consumption. In doing this he effectively conjured up an image of injustice and imbalance in the society. This image had its objective reality in the people's experience. Indeed, every Jamaican is aware of how the middle and upper classes consume conspicuously. This is quite evident in their general lifestyle. This lifestyle is in such sharp contrast with that of the masses in such a small and insular society. The observations that Lacy (1977) made of the Jamaican upper and middle classes in the sixties, was very relevant in the seventies and is frighteningly even more relevant in the eighties. Lacy (1977) described the Jamaican bourgeoisie, of whom the ministers were representatives, as a group that was:

> ...increasingly isolated particularly from the urban masses, beleagured in heavily mortgaged and heavily guarded housing estates, imiatating the latest fashions in dress and thought from North America and countering the surrounding poverty and shacks with conspicuous consumption (p. 76).

Challenging these ministers Michael Manley declared as he waved his rod, "If they have become so well off by corruption then the rod of discovery is going to find out" (Daily Gleaner, 7/2/72). In this part of the message he promised to deal with corruption and graft and correct many of the wrongs of the society. He did not have to spell this out in any concrete way. In giving the promise he conjured up the hope of a better day. At this point in the campaign nothing more was needed. The symbolic was the source of power. On this same occasion another aspect of the message addressed the people's psychological need for someone to fight on their behalf. Manley declared himself to be a sufferers man. He said his life had been devoted to the fight for the sufferers of Jamaica. In a most eloquent way he demonstrated to the masses that he understood them. He also promised to translate their fears, hopes and aspirations into action that would make a difference in society. Michael Manley made these images more vivid by using the themes of the popular songs that were banned by the JLP. He told the mass meeting that Better Must Come means no sedition, no violence, and the suffering can look towards a better day. Let the Power Fall On I means "every man who can't find a job will see others with opportunity and privillege and will pray that if there is a God then Let the Power Fall On I." Beat Down Babylon says "remove oppression, oppression is Babylon; therefore beat down Babylon and let justice rise in my land." In concluding, he again showed the Rod of Correction and said "oppression and corruption are rampant in Jamaica and I am going to beat down oppression" (Daily Gleaner, February 7, 1972).

If Joshua and his rod were to correct the ills of the Jamaican society then they needed to have an effect on the supporters of the PNP. They also needed to hold out some meaning to the opponents of the party. In particular, the JLP and their supporters must respond in a way that showed that they recognized the power of the images. It can be argued that without the JLP's response of fear, the PNP would need to reassess their campaign strategies and the Joshua image would either have to be reformulated or discarded. True to form, and in keeping with the Jamaican political tradition of the mystification of the masses, the JLP responded to the threat of the rod. On the 26th of February 1972, the Daily Gleaner highlighted another mass meeting:

> It was the night of the 'rod' at the corner of Beeston and Wildman Streets. With reaching arms his supporters fought to touch the outstretched 'rod of Joshua' and shouted their disbelief of a claim by a Minister of Finance and Planning, the Hon. Edward Seaga, candidate for West Kingston, that the now famous 'rod' was in his possession after having been dropped by Mr. Manley when he fled a meeting at the Coronation Market (p. 16).

The paper further went on to state that:

> ...an air of high political theatrics and drama characterized the massive meeting, heightened by the appearance of Mrs. Edna Manley, mother of the Leader of the Oposition and wife of the late national hero the Right Excellent Norman Manley. She bore a gift wrapped in an orange package which was later discovered to contain the rod (p. 16).

On this occasion the power of the rod was amplified by the presence of Edna Manley. Her presnce heightened the symbolism of Michael Manley and strengthened his strategy. Michael Manley sent his message and the force of his personality to the opposing forces. He sensed the hysteria of the crowd, the magic of the moment and the power that can come to the individual from the people. He therefore, selectively tapped their need system and delivered another ray of hope in the image of the sufferer's man. The linguistic nuances of the Rastafarian movement assisted him as he declared, "Let them know that there is only one rod of correction in Jamaica and it is I rod. Let them know that when they come with a bogus rod it is I they are dealing with." To the cheers of the crowd Mr. Manley then drew from the box and held aloft a black rod which he described as the true rod of correction having an ivory tip fastened by a brass clasp. "Let us touch it, let us hold the power", shouted members of the crowd (Daily Gleaner, February 26, 1972, p. 16). At this particular mass meeting the cult of the personality was fostered by the fact that the PNP had scored a major psychological victory over the JLP. This victory came because the JLP were also mesmerized by the symbolism of the rod.

The Opposition Responds to the Image

The response of the JLP to the meaning of the rod must be seen within the context of a society in which the masses of the people are mostly illiterate or semi-literate. It must also be understood within the confines of a society in which ideas and concepts are largely controlled by a minority of highly educated persons. These persons control the masses with their interpretation and reaction to events.

Within the JLP, Michael Manley's closest counterpart was Edward Seaga, the Minister of Finance prior to the general elections of 1972. Both of these men has a long history of involvement with the masses, and each had established a power base within his party. Because of his political development and his academic interest in the religiosity amongst the Jamaican masses, Edward Seaga was particularly conscious of the significance of the cult phenomenon that had developed in the PNP camp. His attempt to undercut this phenomenon was illustrated by his party's propaganda that he had Joshua's rod.

Once this strategy failed, the JLP lost a great amount of credibility. It was not difficult for the masses to see Mr. Seaga as a trickster figure when he produced what was labelled in the media as the Stick of Deception. Seaga's stick could not become Joshua's rod. Against the value system and the traditions of the Jamaican society, these two images could never be the same. Michael Manley and Edward Seaga represent different trends within the Jamaican socio-political development. For this reason they will always have different meanings on the level of the people's psyche. The use of the terms 'Seaga's stick' and 'Joshua's rod' emphasize the relative meanings of each of these men, in societal terms. The use of these terms in political rhetoric and in media slogans, removed the dialogue one step from the PNP/JLP political tribalism, to the juxtaposition of two individuals and their separate meanings in the Jamaican society. Furthermore, the words stick and rod symbolically took on the nuances of meanings that can be extrapolated from the personal histories of two persons in a particular socio-historical milieu.

Within this symbolic framework both stick and rod are characterized by the fact that they are both made of wood. However, the rod has a symbolism that no mere stick can ever have. By extension, Michael Manley is indeed the rod of the Jamaican society. He has been steeped and honed in a long tradition of indigenous elites. As such he is indelibly imprinted on the psyche of all classes of his society. For all of these, he captures within his person, many layers of meanings.

Mr. Seaga, on the other hand, is symbolically the stick, in that he is a late comer to the scene. He is a Lebanese and an outsider. He is not part of the historical struggle between the African and the European presence in the ongoing search for a Jamaican identity. This is not to suggest that Mr. Seaga is any less valued in, or valuable to his society. In fact, by the end of the decade of the seventies Michael Manley's Joshua image became dysfunctional. By 1980 Seaga's image of the efficient bureaucrat was seen as the answer to the horrific economic and social problems that has surfaced at that point. This was part of Stone's (1981) analysis. He claimed that:

> As Manley's popularity declined and as socialism came more and more to be associated with violence, conflict, excessive politicization and economic hardships the Seaga image of technocratic competence emerged as a force enticing the support of an electorate weary of long winded speeches that promised much and delivered little. Edward Seaga, therefore, overtook Manley in popular support between 1976 and 1980 as the voters came to place more weight on leadership qualities that seemed to offer stable, predictable and reliable leadership and capable management of the apparatus of government. Seaga projected an almost stereotypical technocratic image in sharp contrast to the inspired, eloquent and charismatic figure projected by Manley (p. 40).

Interestingly, Stone saw Seaga as an extension of Manley's meaning when he argued that:

> ... the image of administrative competence has triumphed over the image of charismatic populism, but the shift in political mood was clearly predicted on the assumption that greater administrative competence could ease the burdens of the poor. Seaga, in effect, has inherited the political legacy of Manley (Stone, 1981, p. 40).

This extension presupposes that of the two, it was Michael Manley who touched the Jamaican psyche at a deep emotional level. At the same time his vision gave clarity to his successor who became the vehicle for his ideas. It is in the juxtaposition of these two contemporary figures that the basis for and the meanings of charismatic leadership can be fully appreciated.

For the Jamaican masses, the meanings of their leaders will be captured in the use of images, symbols and linguistic forms. These will continue to appeal to different levels of their collective unconscious. The credibility of any leader will, for the forseeable future, be hinged not just to the legal-rational aspects of political reality but to the subtle nuances of the personality. The meanings of such personalities will always include a level of response that borders on edges of the irrational. This point is given more concrete and substantive reference in Stone's analysis of the 1976 elections. He discussed the meanings of the contenders in the following:

> A great deal of the campaign centred on the credibility of the two party leaders Michael Manley (PNP) and Edward Seaga (JLP). Manley strode the podium with the charm, eloquence and fervour of conviction of a confident populist leader championing the cause of the oppressed, while Seaga projected an image of bureaucratic efficiency. Additionally, Seaga was tainted with allegations of connections with political violence as well as a questioning of his national and racial origins... (p. 38).

What initially remained on the level of symbolism in the 1972 campaign was voiced in more tangible ways in 1976. This was the period when the PNP, who had come to power without a plan, had to seriously attempt to translate the promises embodied in Joshua into concrete plans and programs.

Image building for political gains must utilize the most appropriate ways of getting meanings across to the broad mass of the people. The PNP and Michael Manley used the stage of the mass meeting, the symbolism of the rod, slogans and film entitled Joshua. In slogans they selected words that elaborated on the themes of magic and messianism. In February of 1972, the Daily Gleaner ran for the PNP advertisements such as the following:

- Hail the Conquering Team
  Better Must Come --- Vote PNP
- The Clarion Call is Sounded
- Speaker: (Joshua) Michael Manley
- The Trumpet Sounds Time for a Change
- Jamaica needs a Moral and Spiritual Rebirth
  to heal the Nation's Ills.

In a similar vein, the newspaper depicted L.O. McGibbon and Co., which is a private sector company, running an advertisement with a picture of Moses with his rod stretched forth across the Red Sea (Daily Gleaner, February 21, 1972). The caption on this advertisement was presented in the following manner:

> And Moses said unto the people
> Exodus, Chapter 14, Verses 13 - 27
>
> for the Egyptian whom ye have seen today ye shall see them again no more for ever. Let us flee from the face of Israel, for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians.

This advertisement was significant not only in its symbolic references, but in the fact that it gave no information of the commodity or service that was offered by the L.O. McGibbon company. The company was more interested in selling a political idea rather than promoting a line of consumer products or services.

Not to be outdone, the JLP, recognizing the inherent power within the slogans, tailored their responses in the same mode. They counteracted the PNP slogans with some typified by the following:

- The Trinity of the Godhead

> Jamaicans were taught that the Trinity is God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost. But some supporters of the PNP think otherwise. To them the Trinity of the Godhead is Moses. (Rev. Claudius Henry), Joshua (Michael Manley) and the

> Lord of Lord (Haile Selassie) (Daily Gleaner, 24/2/72).
>
> - The PNP believe in Michael's Rod
> The JLP believe in Almighty God -- Vote JLP
> - Hail the Man or Hail God

These JLP responses to the Joshua image were revealing of the messianic and religious overtones that the 1972 political campaign had taken on. They were also revealing of aspects of the ideological base of both parties.

By subtly referring to the sacrilege and to a denial of the sanctity of the Trinity by the PNP, the JLP pandered to the fear and mistrust that would surface, when in opposition and government they would successfully invoke the dreaded threat of a communist take over, if Michael Manley remained in power. On the other hand, by placing Claudius Henry in the Trinity they hoped to undercut any redeeming features that either Manley or Haile Selassie might give to the triad. Claudius Henry:

> Repairer of the Breach, founder of the African Reformed Church in Western Kingston proved to be a false prophet to his followers when he was unable to fulfill his promise of repatriation to Africa. His reputation was further tarnished when he was indicted for treason and imprisoned for six years. The subsequent events that revealed murders for which his son Ronald was executed made Claudius Henry a potential source of evil (Barrett, 1977, pp. 95-97).

Henry's inclusion in the Trinity was not accidental. It was done to make an impression on the minds of a people who have historically sought redemption in sources outside of their existential reality.

The 1972 election campaign was fought with overtones of magic and redemptive hope. This hope was based on the idea of a better time when the economic and social injustices would be dealt with. The subliminal and heavenly messages inherent in the rhetoric, songs, slogans and political theatrics were understood and acceptable to the majority of the Jamaican people. Most of them belonged either to the new American Pentecostal sects led by shepherds or to the Afro-Christian sects in whose services spiritual manifestations take on concrete and earthly forms, "Jeremiah, Ezekiel and angels such as Michael and Gabriel and other archangels often appear in these services as real figures (Barrett, 1977, p. 26). Michael Manley, in 1972 was the redeemer figure - the Joshua for his people's liberation.

CHAPTER V

FAMILY PERSPECTIVE AND OTHER VIEWS OF THE LEADER

Introduction

The findings in this chapter are based on the analysis of the interviews in Appendix 1 of this study. These interviews should be read prior to the reading of this chapter.

Family perceptions are generally reflections of intimacy and caring, even when they deal with negative aspects of the lives of any member of the family. Because of this, the possibility of subjectivity in the assessment of family members is oftentimes further compounded by the use of precautionary statements and an effort not to be too explicit in other statements. Family members also have a stake in projecting and protecting a certain image of self and society. This is especially true when the family is as prominent and significant as the Manleys are in Jamaica. These kinds of considerations are particularly important in societies small enough to make any and every detail of the private lives of public figures sensational enough to be used for political gains by opposing forces.

On the other hand, family members are much more alert to aspects of the individual's personality which are undetectable in the public arena. In this sense the two interviews with the Manleys' family members (Appendix 1) are particularly revealing. These interviews are fundamental as a balance to the assessment of others who are not as intimately linked with Michael Manley. Even in areas where they cannot help but be subjective, these family members revealed the ability to strive for objectivity, and in their appraisal of events and issues they have not deviated significantly from the views of others who commented on the same issues.

Both of these interviews were done in the privacy of the interviewees' homes and in a relaxed and informal atmosphere. I was struck by the fact that both made every effort to be cooperative and to give as balanced a picture as possible. Both persons also demonstrated a high level of sensitivity to his or her role. Both were distinguished by their commitment to the social and economic changes that were necessary if their society was to move towards a state of balanced development. Of course, it must be borne in mind that each cannot help but bring to this discussion a sense of his/her individual meanings, visions and needs.

Both persons have been actively involved in the political process and have had formal status and direct roles in the Government of Jamaica between 1972 and 1980. From this vantage point the perceptions of these family members are significant because they have no choice but to see Michael Manley as an individual outside of the private confines of family relationships. They had to observe and understand him in the public arena of political life because they also had formal positions in the PNP. Of significance also are the two distinct points of view inherent in who these persons are--one is a woman who has developed a strong sense of herself and her meanings both in class and racial terms. She has had to face the many contradictions of her role within the family. The other is a man who is at a point of questioning not only the values of his society and his class but the sacred territory of family values and practices, and the meaning of these for the individual. For purposes of this analysis the woman will be referred to as Family Member A and the man as Family Member B.

In these two interviews three major issues were addressed from the point of view of each individual's perspective. These are the personal attributes of Michael Manley's charismatic appeal, the influence of his mother and the limits of his charisma.

The Personal Attributes of Michael Manley's Charismatic Appeal

As a qualitative descriptor of Michael Manley's leadership, those most intimately connected to him agree in their interviews that he is charismatic. They stressed that his charisma must be understood both in terms of his personal dynamics and in terms of the socio-historical and structural elements within the Jamaican society.

On the personal level Michael Manley's charisma cannot be divorced from his background and socio-economic perspective. His family is seen as the most important structural unit that sets the stage for the impact that he had on the masses. His father's stature in the nation was hinged not only on personal achievements but on his ability to deliver on the political level. Thus Michael Manley drew strength from a father image of stability and of action while he came under the influence of a mother whose works of art revealed a belief in the struggles and eventual liberation of the black masses of the Jamaican society. Family Member A substantiates this argument in the following:

> She prophesied through one of her works Negro Aroused, the turbulence that was to come in 1938. This work portrayed the head of a negro raised high, firm and determined.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 365)

Michael Manley's household was unlike that of the majority of people in the Jamaican nation. He was differently raised and was intellectually challenged and stimulated at a very early age. As a child he developed in an atmosphere of creativity and of challenge. His visions were magnified on every level and he could vicariously sense the possibilities of the future. He was surrounded by the symbolism of these possibilities--words, art, music, politics, affluence and glamour. These attributes came together in his later exposure to the various schools of thought in the formal setting of the University.

> He studied abroad, and a great influence on him during his student days was Harold Laski, the Fabian Socialist. Laski lectured to him and these ideas had and continued to have a profound influence on him.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 366)

Charisma is seen by both members of his family as a quality that distinguishes Michael Manley from others. They reiterated that this charisma is generated in part by his background and by the concrete realities of the stature of his father, the role of his mother and the added benefits that come from his access to the privileges of class and economic well being.

> This is the household that Michael grew up in, a household unlike the household of the majority of Jamaicans. Both parents were professionals so he would, from very early, be associated with books, his verandah would have been full of people in the arts because while his father was the leader of the political movement, his mother was the leader of the cultural movement.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 365)

Complimenting his family attributes were Michael Manley's experiences in the Trade Union Movement. These were evaluated by Family Member A as important contributors to his impact on the working class.

> This is where I think you can begin to see the beginnings of what was to end up being his charisma. He was not only involved in the union movement but he was one of persons who founded the National Workers Union...one of the persons who worked during the first year to set it up. He is purported to have driven around in an old standard motor car with a loud speaker attached and went to the factory gate and put on a one man show.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 366)

Through his development in the Trade Union Movement the family members perceived very early in his career a high level of commitment to the grassroots people of the Jamaican society. They also saw the movement as affording him the opportunity to display his capacity for the same kind of bravado and appeal that was earlier displayed by his famous relative--Sir Alexander Bustamante.

> I think that another great influence too would be that a lot of people saw some of Bustamante in him...there are people who say that Michael exemplifies the best in Norman and Bustamante. He is seen as having the grassroots appeal of a Bustamante and the intellect of a Norman Manley. In fact, he also has the physical features that capture something of both of them. His pigmentation is more like that of Bustamante than of his father.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 367)

In this analysis, Michael Manley represented a complex of images and addressed several levels of the dualities of his society. He represented what the masses needed to find in a leader--they needed the image of the worker's man who truly had the interest of the masses at heart. At the same time, he had to have the ability to go beyond the masses intellectually so as to assist them in the creation of their idealized selves. When seen in class terms the Norman Manley/Alexander Bustamante duality presented for Michael Manley a set of profound contradictions, which he ultimately had to confront.

On the other hand, his pigmentation represented the duality of race mixture in that he was neither too white nor was he too black. He was a kind of mythical 'best of both worlds' figure. The questions that continue to haunt this view of the leader seek to find answers in the following: Which world dominates on the conscious and on the unconscious levels? What aspects of the worlds have greater currency? Which world does Michael Manley represent most directly? Must he choose between both or does he represent a third force in cultural, social and intellectual terms? These are the questions about the Jamaican society that Nettleford (1978) addressed in his discussions on culture and identity. These are the issues that persons such as Michael Manley are forced to deal with at a very personal level.

Whatever shades of analysis these questions might pose for the individual, it was clear from the perspective of his family, that apart from the emotional appeal there was a concrete base for Michael Manley's charisma. This base was established prior to his achieving the status of leader of the party.

> In Michael Manley's case the charisma is related to something very concrete in his own experience. Most of his life was given to working with grassroots people. During his years in office he extended the relationship among the oppressed to the international sphere where Jamaica played a very very important part in organizations such as the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 368)

Another personal attribute which was part of the concrete base for his charisma and one which was recognized as a powerful tool is his use of language. This was manifested in his gift of oratory and his ability to select the kinds of words that created images that appealed to various levels of societal and individual needs.

> He had and still has an unparalleled verbal gift and verbal facility. I think he is one of the best speakers on the American continent.
> (Appendix 1, p. 387)

In this he was seen as unlike other charismatic leaders in that he projected this strength without any hint of authoritarianism--that quality which distinguished many charismatic leaders. Michael Manley was seen as a very democratic type of leader by members of his family even though his upbringing within the family was not necessarily experienced as a totally democratic process. Family Member B argued that:

> The family environment was relatively democratic though my old man was definitely not. He was a man of the nineteenth century--a nineteenth century gentleman (which has its virtues and its weaknesses).
> (Appendix 1, p. 388)

Inherent in this statement was the suggestion that the father was both authoritarian and a figure of authority. This would not be an unusual manifestation for persons of his background. It would also not be out of character for a legal luminary and an outstanding scholar at that time in Jamaica's history. In short, Michael Manley developed his notions of democracy in a variety of settings and members of his family acknowledged this distinguishing quality as an asset.

> Michael went to boarding school at Jamaica College, which had a very democratic atmosphere, and he went to the London School of Economics which I think reinforced this. Then he worked for a long time in the trade union, and I think a lot of his approaches were skills that he had developed in the development of the union movement.
> (Appendix 1, p. 388)

Members of Michael Manley's family also acknowledged his industry, perseverance and hard work. These were the qualities which provided a concrete base for the kind of political leader that he became. At the same time his family recognized that these attributes were reinforced by the strengths of his background and the stature of his parents.

A Mother's Influence

A recurring theme in the interviews and a focus of the family members is the role that Edna Manley played in the life of her famous son. An understanding of this role is a possible clue to the symbolism of the female in the total complex of meanings and images that captured the power of Michael Manley's personality.

Edna Manley influenced not just because she was mother and had to play a role prescribed by tradition and reinforced through socialization. She influenced in part because she had made a name for herself. She had her own unique space in the family constellation and she had her own definitions which had been developed in and through her art. This separation of herself from the generalized meanings of the Manley family gave extra leverage to the political fortunes of her son. Family Member B stated:

> The relationship between them is close. Also one must not forget that even now she has a certain political persona of her own "the wife of the Founder of the Nation" and all that.
> There is a genuinely close relationship between Michael and his mother. However, the use of her as a symbol is quite conscious and I don't see anything wrong with that. It is politics.
> (Appendix 1, p. 393)

Family Member A substantiated in the following:

> She has been described as the "Mother of the Nation" because of her whole involvement with Norman Manley. Although she was not explicitly political, she was always very much by his side. This was certainly true in the 1938 disturbance and at other crucial times.

> There is no doubt that he (Michael) goes to her constantly when he faces crises and that the whole mother image is very important to him. As a matter of fact, now that you use the terms image and symbol I think that these play a very large part in his life. I would say that she (Edna) could be considered one of the really powerful women in this country, and even though she has retired from all such people involvement while she continues to do her art, I would say that she is still a force and a powerful person in her own right, and although she is not the kind of person who pushes her point of view on Michael, she is still significant. She does not come to him, he goes to her--there is no doubt about that. This is something that needs the deepest exploration--the relationship between him and his mother.
>
> (Appendix 1, pp. 377-379)

The mother influence is one possible explanation for Michael Manley's success or lack of success on the private level of male-female relationship. Inherent in the above statements is the idea that the power of the relationship that exists between him and his mother is a potential threat to all intimate relationships with other women. He has had four marriages. He professed his profound love for the wife who died. This woman is to a great extent, enshrined in his memory. Of course, destiny cut short her life and her role was circumscribed by time. Michael Manley's success at relationships must be evaluated with those for whom time became an important variable. In this regard the following brief remark by Family Member B is significant:

> Not many children of politicians can maintain the family traditions of their parents. It is not easy to grow up as the child of a politician. It is rough.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 394)

As the texture of the remarks about the dynamics within the family is sensed, the Manley's home emerges as one in which the father was held in awe while the mother supplied the emotional bedrock for situations of stress. Such situations dogged her sons through the demands of their personal and private commitments. This situation was not just a reflection on one Jamaican family. In fact it can be seen as the blueprint for family relations in all classes of the society. Even in those instances where father absence is not a feature of family life, as is the case in most middle class families, it is still the mother who gives support and nurturance on the emotional level. The father's role is generally that of provider and authority figure. There is, therefore, the possibility that both sons and daughters identify very closely with their mother's values, aspirations and visions of the future.

In Chapter IV, Edna Manley's influence on her husband and her determination to produce the Jamaican genius were discussed. In all this it can be recognized that she could easily have come to epitomize to her son, the image of the qualities that were true, good and desirable in women. Whether or not Michael Manley is truly able to make the transference of his affections to a woman who does not come from the same mold as his mother, is a matter for speculation. Perhaps even when he does so, as he has done in his fourth marriage, he apparently still needs the fawning women of his class in order to create a balance in his psyche. Family Member A, questions his ability to break the psychic link with mother in the following:

> There is no doubt that he has a large need to be surrounded by women who adore him. I don't know to what extent some of what he is reaching for is to do with the whole relationship with his mother. There is no doubt that there is an inextricable link. However his mother cannot fulfill all his needs so these find fulfillment through other women. Throughout his life he has had a number of women with whom he has been intimately involved in one way or another and, in or out of power, he is always surrounded by these almost fawning women... To sum up there is no doubt that there is the need

> for a large grouping of a certain kind of women--
> the petit bourgeois woman.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 379)

The perception that Michael Manley needed to be socially close to the men and women of his class, need not be seen as an aberation. In fact it is a very normal response. By the same token, people seek others of their own race and religion for social and emotional contacts. This is particularly evident amongst minorities in all societies. It is as if they need their own kind when they respond at the deepest levels of their emotional beings. Of course this becomes a contradiction of sorts for a politician who needed mass support and who declared himself on the side of the worker. His private responses were interpreted as evidence of his public beliefs. Politicians and other public figures lack privacy because they must continually face public scrutiny of their private, personal responses. It is recognized that public figures must inevitably sacrifice aspects of their personal freedom in order to appear ideologically correct. In this process individuals sometimes suffer unfairly. Yet in historical and political terms, Michael Manley should recognize the legacy through which he gained personal mileage.

Through his linkages with the black woman and with the working class that she represents he has gained much political mileage. It was this woman who passed on, though illegitimately, the oportunity for the development of his particular caste and by extension the meanings that they gained over time. It was the black woman who mothered the Free Coloureds. She not only gave this group their authenticity as the most indigenous sector of the Jamaican population but she symbolically represented the channel through which Michael Manley could be lightened to become the appropriate leader type for his nation.

By the same process that his ancestral grandmother lightened him for social and economic success so also do contemporary linkages blacken him for political gains and personal glory. The following sentiments of Family Member A captured this theme:

> From the point of view that I was black and the average Jamaican woman could look on and say "That is my daughter" or "My daughter looks just like her" I can say that there is no doubt that I 'blackened' his image considerably. Also, in the same way members of the upper petit bourgeoisie disliked the marriage and did everything to stop it. This is something I found out at a later date. I found out that meetings were held to discourage him from marrying this girl. After all "Who is she?"
> So in the same way that his class hated the thought of the marriage, the majority of the working class loved it. So I think to that extent, from a political point of view the union was very good for him.
> (Appendix 1, p. 382)

In a real way the private lives of these individuals reflect a complex of historical juxtaposition of meanings and images. It was history that not only created but merged the public and the private and constantly forced the Jamaican society to confront the unspeakable--the recurring concern about the role of race on both the public and private levels. Thus in two generations, within one family, the society witnessed one leader who married well when he brought hom a near white woman and one who did not marry well, in the eyes of a socially significant sector of the population, when he married a near black woman. The first was Norman Manley's marriage to Edna Manley and the second was Michael Manley's marriage to his fourth wife, Beverly Manley. Edna Manley had to be aware of the subtle nuances of this debate. She was the constant factor through all these changes. As a young woman re-entering her society by the side of her famous husband, she challenged through her work and her world view the racial prejudices of the Jamaican society.

Also, as she raised her sons she had the opportunity to see them reenact in their own lives the conflicts and contradictions around them.

The significance of Michael Manley's choice of his fourth wife goes beyond the narrow definitions of class and race. It is, to a certain extent, a testament of his ideals and commitment to change. The true test of his marriage to Beverly Manley is not whether it fails or succeeds in marital terms but rather that it distinguishes Michael Manley as a leader with a strength of conviction that prepares him for action. This strength of conviction is inextricably linked to the dreams and aspirations of Edna Manley. Indeed, by marrying a black woman of working class antecedent Michael Manley brought together the energies of two powerful women. Beverly Manley, the fourth wife, became the concretization of Edna Manley's abstractions. In order to realize fully the possibility of the dreams which she portrayed in her art, Edna Manley needed to experience in her lifetime the coming together of all the creative forces within the Jamaican people. The fourth marriage of her son Michael is an instance of how this takes on concrete form in the most symbolic of unions.

Edna Manley's influence on her son is seen by members of the family as a profound link that is understandable not so much as a mother-son relationship, but as a complex of creative energy that comes together to symbolize the aspirations of the masses of the Jamaican people.

In all this discussion and in scrutinizing the responses of the family members to the questions that were raised in the interviews it becomes clear that the family produces the individual. The West Indian family, perhaps, like Third World families, are extensions of the traditional extended family. Families, in many senses, attempt to create the individual often at the expense of other members of the family. In other words, all parents deal with problems of sibling rivalry by allotting roles to each child. It is not uncommon to hear Jamaican mothers, especially working class ones, introduce their children with "this is the pretty one", "this is the quiet one", "this is the bright one", "this is the helpful one", this is the bad one", and so on.

As such then, this is something that parents are prone to do especially when they are dealing with children who have equally strong personalities. These are the children who will manifest a high degree of sibling rivalry and conflicts. To neutralize this conflict parents oftentimes give the advantage to one child over the other but they allocate to the one who is to be disadvantaged a somewhat positive though generally passive role. This child will grow up internalizing the image that he or she is supposed to have. The following conversation in one of the interviews is a case in point, Family Member B stated:

> I am regarded as a sort of mirror image. I am the one that's supposed to be quiet and the one that's supposed to be thoughtful.
> Simms: Are you?
> Family Member B: Yes.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 394)

If the foregoing is seen as coming out of the speaker's subconscious, what seems to emerge is a lethally calm statement on the dynamics of the family in its creation of personalities. Once the personality and related self concept have been created for the individual, however mythical may be that creation, when that creation becomes public property then it carries over into the public sphere the familial myth. What was merely familial dynamics on the private level becomes part of the public personality.

When such individuals have extreme political power, the private aspects of the family become the weakest link in the chain that the politician uses to bind the nation together. If the political leader is perceived in messianic and savior terms then he or she is expected to weld a nation together and as such he or she becomes a symbol of binding and integrative force. If within this symbolic frame is a myth that the family dynamics has created, and one into which the individual has simply grown into and through but has not grown above, then that binding force that the individual is supposed to be for the society will have a very weak link. This weak link is that very image that the family created. In such instances, the individual is powerless in the redefinition of self because that self is an internalization of the composite images that are encountered in the process of development.

In this case, the mythology of the super star child who is not the problem child becomes a complex figure in any analytic framework. As such then, aspects that have been repeatedly described as charisma by people who might have a multiplicity of meaning for the term charismatic, is the super star performing for the nation. But the super star leader does not necessarily have to be the most efficient worker or the most foresightful politician.

When the statements by many of the interviewees were assessed, several contradictions emerged. Such contradictions are found between the perception of Michael Manley as not being a parliament goer but being a great orator; between him seeking political office but not being a planner; between his skill with words and crowds and his inability to maintain stable one to one intimate relationships. In these opposing forces is the image of an individual who can communicate very lucidly on one level--the level of public apotheosis and recognition. However, such a person remains on the personal and private level, the product of a family that taught him what to be.

What is apparent from the statements is that the family members are very aware of the leader's achilles heel. They perceive in an intimate way that fatal flaw which gives the charismatic personality its distinguishing quality. This flaw is not necessarily a negative force. In fact, it is the unique strength that the individual possesses.

Erikson's (1958) analysis of Martin Luther's life was supportive of this theme. Erikson (1958) argued that Luther grew up under the same conditions as other young men of his class and time. Like them, he was exposed to an environment where open sex, dirt, grime and the harsh punishment meted out by fathers was the norm. However, unlike others, Luther processed and internalized societal information and traumatic experiences differently. He combined his early childhood experiences and dealt with his internal needs by becoming the most outstanding religious reformer of his time. In this process Luther demonstrated how unique and far-reaching an individual's response to a set of events can be (Erikson, 1958).

Similarly, Mahatma Gandhi's life and work have been analysed as an example of an individual's capacity and predisposition to forge an identity linked to inner needs and drives interacting with social and environmental factors. Gandhi demonstrated his capacity for personal deprivation through denial of his sexual drives. This he accomplished through fasting and through renunciation of material goods. He believed that the reformation of himself as an individual would symbolize and motivate his people's reformation. Gandhi became one of the world leaders who made dramatic changes in his society and inspired others such as Martin Luther King Jr. to pursue a vision of nonviolent revolution.

> "Gandhi's process of self-purification led him to see all political issues as moral ones, just as he linked his own self-determination to the right of self-determination for the Indian people" (Isaak, 1975, p. 32).

The actions and responses of great reformers and other outstanding individuals are not always easily understandable within a single analytic frame. Michael Manley was unorthodox in his style and members of his family were obviously concerned with this. However, familial insights have their own biases and they are rooted in past rivalries, hurts, pains and the cumulative field of personal insecurities and failures. Yet they are instructive even in their apparent subjectivity and their emotional biases. As such, they throw a degree of light on otherwise dark areas of analysis.

Ths Limits of Charisma

As mentioned before, the family members contributing to this analysis have been actively involved in the political process and have had to react to Michael Manley both as family and as leader. These persons had no choice but to confront his style, his approaches and his actions as a politician. By so doing they had to be prepared to discuss both the negative and positive aspects of these.

In the same way that they acknowledged the positive impact of his class and background, they addressed some of the real problems created by these. For instance, the issue of "follow the leader" became crucial when important national decisions were made. In a situation where the leader loomed very large in both psycho-social and political terms, he could effectively use the force of his personality to capitalize on his embodied meanings in order to control the decision making process.

Michael Manley was perceived as the kind of charismatic leader who used strategies of control that were never seen as overtly abrasive but which were extremely effective at all levels and classes of Jamaican society. His power of persuasion seemed not only effective with the largely illiterate and unsophisticated masses, but was extremely useful in dealing with the middle classes and the educated elite--especially those in his party.

In this process he was observed as using two strategies. The first was the opening speech in which he clearly stated his position on an issue. The second was the summing up speech in which he made his position clear. Both would lead to the same end--his views would determine the decision making. Family Member A argued that:

> He would approach an issue before us...by making a twenty minute statement and making his position very clear... The minute he did this, members of the Executive--I would say the majority of the members of the Executive would accept what he said and vote the way he wanted them to vote... Another way in which he aproached decision-making is by entering a debate with the following caveat: "I do not want to influence the decision, I am just going to listen to everybody. I have feelings about it but I am saying nothing. I will be led by whatever the Executive decides"...in the end the vote would go his way.
> (Appendix 1, p. 370)

There is no doubt that the mystique surrounding the leader was hinged in part to who he was, however rather than putting all the emphasis in such situations on the individual, there is need to look at the persons around him and understand why they were prepared to go along with the leader. Such persons have the intellectual capacity to apprehend the nuances of the situation, therefore their acceptance of their leader's style deserve a number of interpretations. Their acceptance might have been an acknowledgement that the leader's views represented their views and interests. It could also have been a testmanet to a high level of patronage. This would not be unexpected in a society where economic goodies were in short supply and everyone who needed to share in the limited spoils must keep in the leader's good graces. Their willingness to go along with Michael Manley could be a signal that the top level management people within the PNP were not prepared to share equally the responsibilities of decision making, hard work and commitment. Thus they put the emphasis on the leader. This was a subtle strategy in which the individual could become the scapegoat, especially when the party failed. Also this response could be an instance of class solidarity. Class solidarity can be achieved in Jamaican society even in organizations which theoretically represent multi-class issues. The middle and upper classes dominate in ways that have little or no relationship to their numbers. Their values, world view and symbolism have currency both for them and for the lower classes. The final explanation could be an element of fear. This was alluded to by Family Member A in the following:

> Hence one of the problems of the charismatic leader is that he looms so large that people are terrified to express their true feelings if these are in opposition to his. On the other hand those who are terrified and who are at a fairly high level of development and will stand up and deal with the leader in these forums, get described as anti-leader. In such a structure and

> climate the worst label is that of anti-leader if the leader is charismatic, because part of the charismatic aura is the holiness and the godliness--therefore, such a leader can do no wrong.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 374)

Underlying any of the reasons why this situation obtained within the PNP or any other political party in Jamaica, were the stark economic realities. For the majority of people the attainment of the very basic commodities which would address the lowest levels of their need hierarchy (health care, food, education, water, housing, clothing etc.) is a constant struggle. This struggle might not be as immediate for the majority of the political power brokers. However, at their level they sense how close they are to the suffering of the masses, especially if they behave in ways that cause them to lose their position in the power structure. Therefore, for socio-economic and related reasons many would not deliberately challenge a powerful leader's right to take control even in situations where majority decisions should obtain.

In looming so large in their societies and in their organizational structures, charismatic leaders become very vulnerable especially in societies where these stated conditions are so close and so immediate. Everyone has an investment in the leader as a person. He or she in turn develops the capacity to absorb all the expectations. It is within this dynamic tension between the ego needs of the leader and the expectations of the led that the idea of infallibility is introduced. This becomes part of the problem of charismatic leadership because in order to prove that he or she is infallible, he or she tries to please everyone on every level of demand.

For Michael Manley the issue became even more complex because he was operating within a party that was distinguished by a variety of tendencies and factions. Each of these had its own vested interests. In order to deal with these, he had to effectively become what was labelled the compromiser/balancer.

> The PNP can be seen as really divided in factions of Right, Centre and Left... Without the charisma it would be almost impossible to maintain this so-called balance, therefore charisma is used from time to time in the interest of one ideology or another...the main characteristic of the charismatic leader has to be his ability to manipulate not only individuals, but groupings within his party or political structure.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 372)

In the end he pleased no one and most importantly the sectors of the society that controlled the economic and social power made sure that he was not able to satisfy the needs of the sectors for whom he held out the greatest hope for change.

Michael Manley, a creature of his background, reflected in his person the contradictions of his class and of his society. These contradictions operated both in positive and in negative terms and were largely controlled by forces external to the individual. Both his strengths and his weaknesses have been addressed by members of his family and in this process each of the contributors was given an opportunity for reflection and introspection which might ultimately signal changes for them as individuals and for their society as a whole.

Party Supporters Look at Joshua

The interviewees who have been identified as supporters of the People's National Party and of Michael Manley individually represent important aspects of the workings of the government between 1972 and 1980. A number of these persons were not as adoring of Michael Manley as they might have been in the past. Their comments and analysis were marked by their effort to be critical and to be introspective. This distinguished them from the opponents of Michael Manley who also addressed some of the same issues.

For the most part, these supporters were looking on the internal dynamics of the Jamaican society and the flaws within their party and within the system. They were not unaware of all of the many external forces that might have impinged on the workings of their regime nor would they disagree with the analysis that was done by Michael Manley (1982) in his book Struggles In The Periphery. In this volume he discussed how economic crises, destabilization, negative growth, violence and other factors affected his government. Instead of rehashing these issues, supporters were prepared instead, to take a close look at themselves and their role in the PNP. In terms of Jamaica's political development this is a very important fact. Indeed, if the society is to benefit from the lessons of the past, then these persons who will continue to play a significant role in their society must reformulate their ideology, strengthen their plans, and make new commitment to attempt meaningful, workable and lasting changes.

In their analysis the supporters of the PNP addressed the issues of Michael Manley's strengths and weaknesses, the dynamics within the PNP, the contradictions of caste and class and the meaning of race. No one in this sample of interviewees was neutral about Michael Manley. Their responses to him ran from one end of the pole that could be described as instances of adoration to the other that could very well be typified by a degree of distrust. They spent more time criticizing Michael Manley's style than they spent on discussing the positive aspects of his philosophy and the programs that were developed during the seventies. Understandably, after a defeat like the one suffered by the PNP in 1980, it is much easier to pay attention to the problems and to the negative aspects of the individual or the group. This allows for critics to find a palatable explanation for the failure of the plans that were drawn up by some of them. The perspective developed by each of these individuals was very important in understanding the dynamics of the seventies. Each person represented the understanding of events within the party because each was actively involved with the workings of government at the highest levels.

The Strengths of a Charismatic Leader

Most of the supporters of the People's National Party recognized the qualities that set Michael Manley apart from the rest of the people in the leadership class within the party. One distinguishing quality that was categorized by everyone was his commitment to democracy. The following were his supporter's descriptions of this quality:

> As far as possible, he wanted to achieve consensus knowing that you might have an isolated defection here or there, but never dealing in a situation where you have open confrontation to the extent that you might get a split in the Party.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 230)

> Michael's strength lies in the fact that he has been able to unite all the tendencies in the party around his leadership. Some people say that he plays this role in order to remain the leader since he is the only one that can have the support of both the Left and the Right.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 311)

> Manley ruled by consensus.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 253)

> He insisted on the democratic process and was influential in the union structure.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 288)

> There is no doubt that Michael Manley falls within this democratic tradition...what he has done is to build on the democratic ethos which he inherited from his father.
> (Appendix 1, p. 258)

Democracy as a value was very much part of the conscious appraisal of Michael Manley's approach to leadership. In further discussion of his weaknesses most observers speculated that this apparent strength could become a shortcoming in the context of Jamaican politics.

Related to his belief in democracy was his perceived respect and empathy for the poor and underclass of his society:

> He undoubtedly has a very sincere, genuine and powerful feeling for the poor; a strong disgust with oppression; a high sense of justice in regard to inequalities and unfairness of all sorts...he speaks with great feeling on all matters that are connected into areas of justice--fair play, equality, the rights of people who are underdogs and so on.
> (Appendix 1, p. 348)

> He approaches people with great tolerance and respect for their feelings. He had a great deal of sensitivity to people.
> (Appendix 1, p. 258)

> He believes explicitly in the power, the force and the creativity of the masses.
> (Appendix 1, p. 257)

> Manley has a deep respect for the Jamaican people (the masses).
> (Appendix 1, p. 250)

> He is very committed to the masses and is somewhat left of centre ideologically.
> (Appendix 1, p. 253)

The emphasis on the democratic approach to the political process coupled with his apparent concern for the masses have had the most concrete manifestation and the greatest impact in Michael Manley's performance as a leader within the trade union movement. Many of his critics believed that his greatest achievements had been within this arena and that his appeal as leader of the PNP cannot be separated from his stature within the union. Recognition of his performance within the union was summarized in the following observations of a trade unionist:

> When Michael Manley sat at the bargaining table, he enunciated in the most magnificent terms, an entire new range of concepts and tought... A whole range of benefits and provisions, including the question of a man's right to have his job, were highlighted by Michael Manley in 1964....
> Michael Manley gave the most fluent presentations as a negotiator. He argued eloquently on the sanctity of arbitration and the right of the worker to enjoy the award that the arbitrator was handing down.... Michael Manley not only set the standards for these negotiations, but he established a whole code of behaviors for delegates at the workplace and at the bargaining table.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 286)

Michael Manley is undoubtedly a complex person. His supporters acknowledged his penchant for democracy, his deep respect for the Jamaican people, his ability to relate in such a way as to convince others that he cares, his unparalleled skills as a negotiator, his contribution to the legislative changes that would eventually affect the lives of workers, his flamboyance, his good looks, and the credibility that his lineage gave him with the different social groupings within his society.

These qualities were based on the assessment of his attributes and of the role that he continued to play in his society. In this regard his supporters were not just partisan in political terms. They were serious critics of their society. They identified the positive aspects of Michael Manley and his leadership while they incisively commented on the other side of the coin--his apparent weakness.

The Leader is not Infallible: Supporters' Assessment of Michael Manley's Shortcomings

Michael Manley obviously is a person who poses a complex profile for most of the people who work for and around him. In the same way that they recognized his magnetic qualities and the appeal that he has on crowds of people, they also struggled to come to grips with apparent contradictions in this appeal. For many this dilemma was reduced to the belief that Manley is over democratic or that he tries too hard to please everyone. Such statements were given elaboration and deeper analysis by the persons who have had to deal with these vicissitudes in very intimate and profound ways. In this process there was a sense of the frustrations that confronted not just these individuals but the whole PNP leadership in the latter years of the seventies.

A lack of decisiveness was a quality that marked Michael Manley's style of leadership. This was identified around some of the major policy questions that were raised during his term in office and the debate around the International Monetary Fund (IMF) seem to have been the culminating point in this process. Because of his perceived vacillation on issues that would ultimately affect the changes that were needed in the social structure of the society:

> "some people came to feel that he is not genuine"
> (Appendix 1, p. 302)

These contradictions were further aggravated by the economic pressures at the time:

> The shortages of supplies, unemployment, the scarcity of money, the increasing sabotage by the privte sector and business classes all created problems. These were not helped by the public perception of Manley's vacillation on some of these issues.
> (Appendix 1.)

A sizeable faction within the party needed a leader who would make decisions even though these might be unpopular with some of his supporters. The overriding consensus was that he would need to make a crucial decision of breaking the ties with his class and their interest and throw in his lot with the working classes/masses tht he professed to respect. His indecisions on these occasions were interpreted by some as evidence of his commitment to bourgeois democracy:

> The contradictory forces that Manley led--those forces cannot get anything implemented as long as he is trying to balance them and hold them in unity...he has more fear of the landlord forces than of the anti-land forces.
> (Appendix 1.)

Others carried this perception of his inability to break with his class values one step further and implied that his concern for the poor was part of his whole moral and ethical stance and his self perception as a democratic person. And that this commitment was not to be seen in solid political terms. In these terms his weakness was identified as an insufficient understanding of the capacities and ultimate potential of the working class and an overrating of the power of imperialism. One critic argued that:

> This leads, therefore, to insufficient boldness in mobilizing, organizing and galvanizing the power of the people as a means of anchoring policies and programs which naturally and inevitably stimulate the class opposition of the ruling circles and imperialism. So if we look at his style in relation to situations of acute national class struggle, his weaknesses become apparent. His inclination in those circumstances is to compromise more than is necessary, given the balance of forces between the working class and the working people nationally, regionally and internationally....In that context, then, we get an inclination to compromise more with the ruling circles than is necessary....
> (Appendix 1, p. 349)

The fear and protection of his class interest was a recurring theme in the constant questioning of Michael Manley's leadership. This theme was used to explain his stance on issues such as worker participation and on disciplinary actions within the ranks of the party and the government. The following stances are examples of these vital issues:

> In June of 1980 there was an attempted coup in Jamaica. It was widely and naturally condemmed by all social classes...Here was an opportunity to act decisively to reduce the presence of and to weaken the unconstitutional reactionary officer corps....Manley did not act decisively...He ended up in this case in effect retaining the composition, structure and class character of the security forces inherited from the JLP who inherited it from the colonial regime.
> (Appendix 1, p. 350)

> I think that the one issue on which he was definitely weak had to do with the state sector. In this sector, there were people who were sabotaging the party and the government, but I don't think that the government took any fundamental steps on this. This area was definitely a weakness. One cannot understand how a government could knowingly allow people to sabotage it. In 1976 there were also elements in the Army and in the Police who were involved in political activities. There were ample grounds on which to apprehend these persons, yet the government under Manley never acted because they didn't want to build up further hostility.
> (Appendix 1, p. 308)

Thus the dominant perception of the supporters was that Manley had not broken with his class interest. It was not clear that such a break would have made a difference in the practical arena of the political process. If the economy was largely controlled by the people of his own background then alienating them might not have produced more in terms of goods and services for the people. On the other hand, by appearing to court his class interest Manley psychologically undermined the energies of the middle class cadres who were committed ideologically to the social and structural changes in their society. This group (identified by their left leanings) became more and more frustrated. It is logical to conclude that they also gave up and did not pull their weight, especially towards the latter part of the seventies when the party was very obviously losing touch with reality.

Whether these criticisms of Michael Manley's style was part of the perception of the left wingers within the party or not, is not the issue. The issue is that nearly everyone who commented on Michael Manley's style identified a tendency to vacillate. The political beliefs, or world view of his supporters influence their way of analyzing the reasons for this vacillation. The more doctrinaire leftists used a strict class analysis while the moderates or more right wing ones used other frames of reference. In total, all questioned his motivation while they sung his praises. Alternative explanations of his motivations included the class analysis and psycho-social theories. The following conclusions of two interviewees are illustrative of this:

> Manley has a deep respect for the Jamaican people (the masses) but he also suffers from a sense of shame and a degree of guilt in the Eriksonian model, because of his class origins. His awareness of not being one of them is an inhibiting factor. In order to make up for this he a) becomes too dependent on advisors; b) is too hesitant in making decisions; and c) overcompensates for this perceived weakness by an overly apologetic stance.
>
> This guilt and shame of his class background is further exhibited in a dependence on approbation and the need for constant ego massaging. Manley, then is a man who wants to be praised and because of this he can be very easily demoralized, especially by the print media which capitalized on this personality flaw and set out deliberately to demoralize him, especially during the 1980 election campaign.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 250)

> It is a complex issue and in effect this tendency to vacillate, to fence sit, to be indecisive and sometimes to reverse decisions, is a general feature of the post-colonial state. It is a feature of this

> state because, relative to other forces within the society, the political force is weak. In other words, those who represent the state are relatively weak. They have to contend with important social forces that have politically relevant resources and that are experienced in political participation. The working class from which the post-colonial leader draws support, has very limited economic resources. This is an important factor.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 260)

Captured within these explanations was a sense of a group of persons groping for an understanding not only of the leader's behavior but of their own responses to his leadership. Indeed the contradictions that were inherent within Michael Manley were the contradictions inherent within his society. He was merely an extension of societal forces. His significance laid in the meanings that he had for his society. Everyone focused on the leader in order that attention could be diverted from his or her own need to follow blindly in some cases. The individual became the symbol of the group's strengths and weaknesses and ultimately became the scapegoat when things went wrong. One supporter noted:

> ...a problem remains when there is a powerful charismatic leader who dominates the political process. It has the effect of other leaders leaving all announcements and pronouncements to him so that he comes to gain an all embracing image. He announces the major policies in industry, commerce, agriculture and all other fields. This tends to detract from the ministers who hold these portfolios and strengthens the central leader.
>
> (Appendix 1.)

When such statements were analyzed the inherent contradictions became apparent. The statement that "other leaders leave all announcement and pronouncement to him" is in conflict with "this tends to detract from the minsters". The initial response is to a group of persons who would quite gladly shift their responsibilities to the leader in order to protect themselves when the political fortunes were down. On the other hand if the leader gained more and more applause because he was saying the right things then the ministers' effect was diminished and they then became jealous of the popularity of the leader. This process is complex. In fact it is the proverbial double bind and within this situation charismatic leadership has its own built-in destructive force.

The Dynamics Within the PNP

The more the responses of Michael Manley's supporters were analyzed, the more the role of the Party became a factor in understanding why he had to use certain strategies and approaches to maintain unity within the ranks of the leadership. The PNP is a vehicle that enhances both the strengths and weaknesses of its leader because within its basic philosophy and structure are guidelines for action that will utlimately become areas of conflict.

Some critics say that the PNP was developed by Norman Manley to reflect his belief in the democratic process:

> The Party has a firm democratic tradition and Norman Manley, the founder, was very concerned about building such a tradition. In this respect he carefully laid the institutions and processes within the Party which would deflect any emphasis on a personality. There is no doubt that Michael Manley falls within the democratic tradition.... What he has done is to build on the democratic ethos which he inherited from his father. The party was from these beginnings, a democratic structure and this structure still exists. Within this there are rules and regulations dealing with how one operates within the party if one is to maintain membership.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 258)

On the one hand this democratic tradition enhanced the leader who was committed to democracy while at the same time the very nature of the

Party structure created a dilemma for such a person. Michael Manley's appearance of indecisiveness was an issue with all who discussed his style. Many sought the explanation for this vacillation in the Party's structure:

> We have to look at the character of the People's National Party. It is notoriously a party of tendencies. The two dominant ones are the left leaning and the right oriented tendencies. These two assume dominance and hegemony at particular periods of time. Therefore, when the left is in the ascendancy the policy regime will tend to lean in that direction. When the right is in the ascendancy the regime leans to a rightist position.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 261)

> The PNP can be seen as really divided in factions of Right, Centre and Left (however one wants to put it)... The leader (fitting Rex Nettleford's description of Norman Manley) becomes a compromiser/balancer. To a large extent, Michael Manley sees leadership in the same way....I think he sees his leadership as straddling the Right, the Left and the Centre; to him the success of leadership depends on the extent to which he could have a harmonious whole.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 372)

This relationship between the party's structure and the leader's performance became part of the style of leadership. When this style was seen as contradictory, then the party structure was seen both in positive as well as negative terms. This became a real ideological issue both for the individual leader and the group (the party). This was clearly demonstrated in the following observation:

> Michael's strength (sometimes defined as a weakness by some) lies in the fact that he has been able to unite all the tendencies in the party around his leadership. Some people say that he plays this role in order to remain the leader since he is the only one that can have the support of both the Left and the Right. Those who see this as a weakness argue that he is always trying to balance and compromise the Left and Right so that he can find a middle position....Manley sometimes
>
> compromises because he cannot afford to alienate any one side, especially the Right.
>
> (Appendix 1.)

Obviously this left/right dichotomy that was being discussed was a more politically palatable way of defining the inequalities of class and caste within Jamaican society and by extension, the kind of power that is held by the ruling classes. By implying that the leader cannot afford to alienate the right, the interviewees alluded to the power of class alliances and by implication, to the realization that change for the masses will remain largely at the level of rhetoric rather than action. This obtained not because Michael Manley was not committed to internal change but because the forces against his strategies were much more powerful than the party supporters were prepared to admit.

Another significant party contradiction was highlighted in one of the interviews. This was the issue of a party so structured as to develop collective leadership and ensure that the cult of the personality does not detract from the party's aims and objectives. This apparent contradiction was analyzed as a feature of the Westminster Model:

> Inherent within the Westminster Model, which we adopted or which was given to us, is the phenomenon that people vote for persons or individuals as personalities. Constitutionally, Jamaicans do not vote for the PNP or the JLP; they do not vote for a party, they vote for a person. What this means is that it is the flamboyant dominating personalities who were more often successful at the polls.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 232)

The dynamism of the strong personality has been captured in the figures that have dominated all popular movements (political and non-political). Certain historical conditions were used to demonstrate how the PNP, which was initially conceived as a structure that would enhance the democratic process by its different levels of leadership and responsibility, became a party that adapted to the idea of the strong charismatic leader type.

> As far as the apparent contradiction between the PNP's democratic organizational structure and the personal dominance of Michael Manley one has to look into historical directions--inside the PNP and outside the PNP. Inside the PNP we see that in the early days, there were a number of strong personalities typified by Norman Manley.... Bustamante eventually eclipsed Norman Manley because of his role in the labour struggle at the time Manley's personality also did not have the kind of dominance within the organization because he believed in the democratic and the organized approach.... There were also some other strong personalities who were leaders within the national movement in their own rights.... The democratic organization of the PNP facilitated all of these people within its structure.... However, in 1952 many of these leaders were expelled from the PNP.... The second aspect is what was happening outside of the PNP--this is the phenomenon of Bustamante.... The party responded more and more to Bustamante by making its leadership more and more like him.... Michael Manley therefore became not just president the constitutional designation of the PNP, but he became the leader--the comrade-leader..... Michael Manley is also not just president of the party, but he is comrade-leader.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 233)

It was indeed the aura of the comrade-leader that was maintained through the Man of Destiny (Norman Manley), and the Joshua (Michael Manley) images. These images gave credibility to all those who represented the party and when the times were right these images made great gains at the polls.

As a party, the PNP was both a vehicle for societal change as well as a way of preserving the status quo. If its members adhered to the idea of the democratic process as a means of people sharing in the decision making process, then it could create a climate in which all people developed the skills to critically analyze their existential reality while they engaged in action to change these. On the other hand it has been experienced as a political structure that was flexible enough to accomodate the inflexibilities of the Jamaican society, and herein laid not only its contradictions but its limitations.

The Contradictions of Class and Caste: The Meanings of Race in Jamaican Society

The question of class alliances and the overlap between class/caste and racial features surfaced in all approaches aimed at understanding the socio-historical and resultant economic relationships within the Jamaican society. There is no discipline that has not enticed scholars to attempt to come to grips with the complexity of the caste/race overlap and the ever present unpredictability of the political climate. Within this framework, one of the recurring and debatable themes was that of the role of race and class in Michael Manley's world view and his related actions. The following comment demonstrated this concern:

> This is where to explain the subjective in terms of leadership and in particular Michael Manley's limitations. Class and race must come into that explanation. Also to explain the objective limitation that he was operating within--again class and race must come into it, but this time one must look at the composition of the forces that support him.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 268)

The whole issue of class alliances and the role of race becomes a very emotional one for most Jamaican scholars and commentators. It is not that race is not an objective entity. Indeed, in racial terms Jamaica is, for all intents and purposes, a black society. The majority of its inhabitants are black. As the nuances of racial meanings are apprehended there is need to question why this objective fact becomes such a psychological burden and why there is such an ambivalence in the recognition of black dominance in societal terms.

The following questions and answers are recorded to underline not only the complexity of the meanings of race and class but the racial preoccupation that was part of the consciousness of the political elite:

SIMMS: Is race an issue in Manley's appeal?

A: His parents were both champions of racial equality. However his obvious color and background might have raised questions as to the extent or the degree to which this would be a problem. Color is seen in Jamaica as an attitude rather than a shade of skin.
(Appendix 1, p. 255)

SIMMS: Some people argue that Jamaicans choose their leaders because of what they can deliver on the material level.... Do people like Manley and Seaga have an easier entrance into leadership than, say, a black Jamaican of whatever intellect or integrity?

A: There is some truth to that but we need to understand that our people have two sides to them. Like any people, they have a side which is deeply drawn to colonial conditions and influences, which include a high degree of racism and hatred for themselves. Also, they have another side to them--a revolutionary side...and there is a constant tussle between the two.... Leaders such as Manley do have some advantages in normal times, but the more times get turbulent the more what is normally an advantage becomes a disadvantage. It is very, very contradictory.
(Appendix 1, p. 356)

SIMMS: Do you think it was the class values within Jamaican society that made Michael Manley more acceptable to both the power and the working class...?

A: In a sense that was so, but Manley's individual personal mannerisms and skills, coupled with the fact that he was the son of Norman Manley and also island supervisor of the union, made him the top man. The employers, therefore, wanted to deal with the top.... The workers also had to be educated to understand that they could not always have the leader....
(Appendix 1, p. 288)

SIMMS: Can you clarify how Michael Manley used the symbols that he might have conjured...by going to Africa; how these assisted his leadership?

A: As I indicated, the context within which he went to Africa was important.... 1968 was the year of what came to be popularly labelled the "Rodney Riots".... Black leaders such as Stokely Carmichael and Martin Luter King, Jr. had a great influence on the politics of the Caribbean....In 1968 the Black Power Movement was on the rise in Jamaica and the expulsion of Walter Rodney from Jamaica led to the serious riots in Kingston.... The Black Power riots showed that people were dissatisfied with the whole economic set-up and they were conscious that the majority of the

> Jamaican people are black and that they are the ones that are still deprived and oppressed.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 241)

SIMMS: How did his privileged background contribute to his reputation as a leader of the working class?

A: Because of the snobbery of the working class people.... Look at the great Jamaican leaders. In recent years there has only been one outstanding working class black leader and that is Marcus Garvey.... Bustamante was a fair-skinned middle class man... Bustamante's great opponent when he moved into the union field was a black working class man--Father Coombs.... Who did the masses follow? They followed Bustamante.... They had a choice... The masses followed Bustamante and they left Coombs.... Race is used ruthlessly in every election, the colour of the candidates is gone into in greatest detail... I would like to understand if the appropriate role for a black working class candidate is slightly different from that which is expected of a white upper class candidate.

(Appendix 1, p. 389)

SIMMS: Do you think that his marriage to you had enhanced his political career? I am asking this because you are the first obviously black woman that he married.

A: Not only married, I think I was the first that he even dated seriously.... From the point of view that I was black and the average Jamaican woman could look on and say, "That is my daughter" or "My daughter looks just like her". I can say that there is no doubt that I blackened his image considerably.

(Appendix 1, p. 381)

All the complexities and contradictions of the Jamaican social history were captured in the above statements. These persons eloquently addressed the ambivalence towards race and colour, and the ruling class preoccupation with colour.

The ambivalence towards race is not simply a case of everyone preferring the lighter over the darker pigmentation. It is rather the more complex question of a lighter skinned leader having to legitimize himself in ideological terms. In other words, even though his colour of skin is valued on one level or another it still has to gain social and phychological legitimacy. Inherent in this is the idea that in an ex-slave/ plantation society such as Jamaica, a basic distrust exists and this distrust will always surface when the times are right. For this reason statements such as "race is an attitude rather than a colour of skin", though comprehensible on some levels of analysis, become meaningless in the stark objective political arena. In Jamaica colour is a shade of skin for the majority of the population.

It is this realization that gave credence to the observation that there are two sides to the Jamaican psyche--the internalization of the negative feelings about blackness, counterbalanced by the revolutionary side that attempts on many occasions to assert the dignity of the black masses. These assertions have been historically recorded in the many slave rebellions, Maroon wars, Garveyism, Revivalism, Rastafarianism and the Black Power Movement, etc. The common thread that ran through all these attempts at redemption is the fact that colour (blackness) was the basic conceptual framework for the rhetoric that was aimed at giving dignity to the masses.

The correlation of shade and caste make colour and race relevant factors in the Jamaican class struggle. All leaders (present and future) will, of necessity, have to confront the racial issue. As the economic realities force the poor to face their deteriorating standard of living then the Jamaican politicians will face the "turbulent times" in which the "lighter shade advantage can easily become a disadvantage". (Appendix 1, p. 358) In such times the objective reality of poverty became the reference point for the development of an ideology geared to social and political change.

Through these interviews a certain degree of insight was gained into the psychology of the Jamaican ruling class. They all recognized blackness as a force that could eventually raise the question of their relationship to the masses. It is for this reason that a statement such as "race is used ruthlessly in every election" became significant.

> ...if you look at Parliament people of all colour run in elections, but who runs the show? There is no doubt about this--it is the brown middle class. This is one of the face cards. Everything is done in the name of the masses but the masses never do it.... How many genuine working class persons are leading? I mean there are lots of black people in Parliament.... We have a black middle and upper class existing now, but it is these that run things in the name of the workers....
> (Appendix 1, p. 390)

The more the power class was forced to look within itself and examine its values, motivations and actions the more it faced the dilemma that is implied in the above statement. The overriding implication is that in their role as leaders they usurped the rights of another group of persons. The contradiction in this kind of attitude has grave consequences for societies such as Jamaica. As long as race and class are correlated the ruling class will continue to make apologies for their apparent advantage in racial terms. They will be forced to either fortify themselves against all resistance to their power or they will have to find new and creative alternatives to the ways by which they have traditionally legitimized themselves.

Obviously colour and caste impinged on all aspects of human relationships in Jamaican society. The subtleties of this were elaborated on by a writer such as Rex Nettleford (1971) in his earlier work Mirror, Mirror. In light of this, it was not surprising that the private lives of individuals were assessed in racial and class terms. Even when such individuals had redeeming class features, their legitimacy was further questioned in racial terms. This then became a very emotional and complex issue and in the final analysis individual political stance and political views were formulated around and reinforced by experience of the snobbery of class. Such experiences could motivate the following:

> In a way, the most dangerous kind of charismatic leader is not the working class leader but the petit bourgeois charismatic leader, because this latter has things going for him that a working class charismatic leader would not have. It is the petit bourgeois who cream off the best of the society in terms of education, social contacts in the Jamaican experience--the complexion and the family background.... Michael Manley, the essence of the petit bourgeois leader, the brightest and the best who talks well, manipulates well and does everything so well, overwhelms those who see themselves as low men on the totem pole.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 375)

The last sentence is highlighted because it captured and epitomized the earlier reference to the explanation of both the subjective and objective in racial and class terms--a complex of contradictions and a quagmire of emotions.

Michael Manley: How his Political Opponents See Him

For the purposes of this study the interviewees who were identified as opponents were those who belonged to parties other than the PNP. This division of the sample into supporters and opponents was done more for manageability of the information than as a demonstration of ideological differences between individuals and between parties. Both groups of persons identified the same issues but they interpreted them in slightly different ways, and this difference of interpretation was attributable both to their party positions and to the individuals' responses on a very personal level.

Opponents of Michael Manley recognized him as a charismatic person whose charisma was based to a great degree on his personal qualities (his family background, his glamour, his oratorical skills, and his mass appeal). These qualities go together to make him a formidable political opponent and a force to be reckoned with in any political forum (nationally and internationally). Comments such as the following attested to his opponents acknowledgement of the strength of Manley's personal attributes and commitments:

> He undoubtedly has a very sincere, genuine and powerful feeling for the poor; a strong disgust with oppression; a high sense of justice in regard to inequalities and unfairness of all sorts, and this means that he speaks with great feeling on all matters that are connected into areas of justice--fair play, equality, the rights of people who are the underdog and oppressed and so on.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 348)

> Manley has what is commonly called charisma. This charisma is linked to his possession of four qualities:
> 1. a dominant personality
> 2. personality--he is flamboyant and glamorous
> 3. a gift of oratory
> 4. political instinct
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 345)

> You have to understand Manley as one of those Jamaicans who has a background of fortune; his father was probably about 75% Irish, his mother is English. In Jamaican context he is a privileged boy, born in a high class home....
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 334)

> This goes to show Mr. Manley's multifaceted character. In other words, he, up to the time that he took office was very much a middle class, what is called high brown or even white Jamaican, with upper class habits, upper class behaviour patterns and upper class friends and associates....
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 316)

Counterbalancing these obvious positive attribues of his class background and personal qualities are Michael Manley's weaknesses which were seen by his opponents as consequences of his personality. This was an interesting point of departure between those classified as supporters and those who were obviously opponents. The former group tended to look towards the values of caste and class. They defined issues in terms of the class conflict that historically resulted from the struggle of the ruling classes to maintain their power while the masses struggled to throw off their oppressors. They therefore saw Michael Manley's greatest weakness as his inability to break his links with his class interest and make a total commitment to the masses. The latter group demonstrated a great preoccupation with Michael Manley as an individual rather than with the nature of his party or his policies. They inferred that there was a personality flaw that caused Michael Manley to pursue his particular type of ideology. The overriding concern by these persons was the fact that Manley betrayed his class interest in his effort to give justice to the masses.

To a great degree it can be argued that the strength of Michael Manley's personality had a different kind of meaning for his opponents than it objectively had for members of his own party. The power of his appeal was recognized within his camp. However the PNP with its structures, formal party apparatus and planned educational programs held out hope for a gradual erosion of the cult of the personality. This tended to neutralize the responses of the leader class to the individual and gave form to the philosophy of Democratic Socialism as it was defined within the Party. The JLP on the other hand, had never demonstrated the same sophisticated level of party organization. With their commitment to the free enterprise system and to the freedom of the individual to exploit any aspect of the economy in order to maximize profits, there came the attendant preoccupation with the individual as an entity divorced from the larger society. For this reason they found Michael

Manley, as a person, very threatening. To them he became an enigma of sorts and they responded to him with a passion that bordered on a kind of love/hate level of response. For instance, the same person said the following about him:

> ...to be honest--he is one of the brighter chaps in the country. He received a good education, he has a beautiful vocabulary and he has developed a style--real style. He is a very charismatic chap and his charisma comes from the fact again of what Jamaicans think.
> (Appendix 1, p. 334)
>
> Manley should not have led the PNP because there were men in the PNP who were much more capable in terms of experience and in terms of dynamism in leadership, but they were not as charismatic as Manley.
> (Appendix 1, p. 335)
>
> He had, I would say the best mobilized and the best period of people's mobilization in the country in 1972, and in two years he muffed it. He muffed it because it was a different period from this one, and in 1972 people were willing to share and there were things to share.
> (Appendix 1, p. 337)
>
> For the ten years that he was there he never was able to demonstrate the type of leadership which comes from being able to take decision, and being able to generate around him people who take the right decision, and give the right type of leadership.
> (Appendix 1, p. 335)

These remarks highlighted the contradictions that are not just within the person being discussed but within the persons who did the discussion. At the same time that informants emphasized the positive aspects of Michael Manley's personal style they also concentrated on the negative, not just as a means to balance what might very well be a condition of human interaction in the Jamaican political sphere, but as an effort to prove that the weaknesses as they are perceived cancelled out whatever positive effects that might have accrued.

Because the members of JLP were not only opposed ideologically to what they perceived as Michael Manley's political views, but were also overly mesmerized by the force of his personality, they had a tendency to want to psychoanalyze him within the limits of their individual world view and belief system. The problem with their general approach was their over reliance on information based on gossip and on what they viewed as the sensational aspects of Michael Manley's personal and private life. This kind of approach negated the effect that their analysis could have had and reduced their responses to the antagonism of partisan politics and the obvious tribal overtones that Jamaican politics has taken on. The political opponents of the right tended to be less critical of issues and policies. Instead, they pandered unintentionally, perhaps, to the power and responses of the individual and negated the effect of the group. The following are examples of the kinds of remarks that are instructive of this theme:

> I am sure that people who psychoanalyze him would recognize that his whole family background did a lot for him in his achievement and also created the indiscipline that he has. He is a man who has divorced two women, one died and is separated from the other. That shows the man's inability to manage a home and, in my opinion, shows his inability to manage a country.
> (Appendix 1, p. 335)

> There are people who say that the answer to people like Mr. Manley's character is to be found in his relationship with women; his relationship with his mother which is very deep and very close and very interesting; and his relationship with his father.
> (Appendix 1, p. 319)

When such an obsession with aspects of the individual's life is voiced by ministers of the government, one is tempted to wonder if too much effort is being made by the JLP in power to destroy Michael Manley as an individual rather than finding ways of fulfilling the dreams of the masses in concrete and workable terms. This question cannot be answered in the short term. It is one that has to be suspended and tested against the Jamaican political fortunes over the next five years.

In general terms, members and supporters of the JLP critized Michael Manley's efforts at social reform as an example of a divisive strategy aimed at disrupting the society. The underlying motif of all this is the idea that Manley betrayed his class and in this betrayal he has to be seen as mentally unstable. In other words, he must be 'mad' to try and upset the power position of his class and of his traditional supporters. Inherent in this response is the idea that all want betterment for the society. However betterment must not cause any hardship for those who have understood betterment in material and power terms for a long time.

A statement such as "he lost us our innocence" is a metaphor for the resistance to social change and, as such, is a metaphor for the continuing struggle for economic and psycho-social balance in a society that is overwhelmed by the day to day problems on the basic levels of human survival the problems of how to adequately feed, clothe and house the nation.

An Attempt to Reinterpret the Values: The Question of Class Betrayal

> I am not sure to what extent Michael realizes this linkage or is conscious of it, but the research that I have done reveals a man who is frightfully reincarnated in his son.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 372)

In a real sense, Michael Manley inherited his father's mantle and followed in his footsteps, though reluctantly, as he admitted in his interview. His father made his decision to enter politics on the basis of mass conviction. This was eloquently demonstrated in Nettleford's, 1971, work Manley and the New Jamaica. Michael Manley entered public life through leadership of the working class. Twenty full years of experience in the Trade Union Movement prepared him for the jobs of Leader of the Opposition and later Prime Minister of Jamaica. His early education and later political formation must therefore be seen in terms of the full understanding of the need to bring the Jamaican masses as wage earners and as a potentially productive sector to the centre of the Jamaican political concern. In this effort he needed a conceptual framework in which to articulate and make sense of the contradictions of his society. Essentially, Michael Manley, like many of the political thinkers of his time, reflected a penchant for a class analysis rather than a race analysis. Socialism provided the appropriate formula--it was rational and scientific, therefore, it was a convenient and palatable approach for coping or not coping with the variable of race which is indeterminate, emotional, irrational and by extension extremely difficult to deal with, especially in the Jamaican society. In other words, Jamaicans of all colours are socialized into a value system of not talking frankly about racial matters. This was most succinctly expressed by Michael Manley himself in the interview which is recorded in Chapter VI.

> If you raise race as an issue, then you are a wicked fellow who is stirring up the masses to hatred--that's partly why. The other reason is that some of the steam is taken out of that situation by the fact that we don't run a rigid race line. There is racial mobility, enough token racial mobility to keep alive the notion that we are not really a racist society, but we are a racist society because the equation between class and race is so tight, the hostility between the two so complete.... I think the reality is what it is but not a la America, and, of course, not a la South Africa. These are different expressions of that kind of thing.
> (See Chapter VI, p. 171)

By the election of 1980, many of his one time supporters and current detractors had dismissed Michael Manley as a black nationalist rather than a true-blood socialist. This debate between Manley and the purist Left has been neutralized and perhaps distorted by the events that took place in Grenada in 1983.

Whether Manley was ideologically correct or not becomes an issue for a sector of his party and his followers. On a wider scale his wholesale adoption of Democratic Socialism with a tinge of class conflict, however mild, definitely grated against the temperament of his class (PNP and JLP alike). As a Fabian Socialist, his father Norman was barely acceptable by most of his class. He was suffered and then revered because of his nationalist commitment to the taking over of the country from the colonial office. This was perceived as a move that would and has benefitted the middle and upper classes. They were the natural heirs of the British raj. Democratic Socialism, as espoused by Michael Manley, was a design for sharing power with the lower classes to the extent that they would be allowed meaningful participation in the determination of national goals. This he clearly stated in his book The Politics of Change.

This emphasis of mass participation in any but a token way coupled with Michael Manley's political preoccupations with the linkages between all Third World efforts at liberation was seen by his class as distracting and irrelevant to Jamaican middle/upper class needs. In this framework all his efforts at social reforms, including the Bauxite Levy, were seen as acts too near to the reprehensible habits of communism. In the parlance of the Jamaican petit bourgeoise communism was that system which on the narrow level could be seen as anti-middle class. On the wider level it could be sold to the masses as evil, anti-God and anti-freedom. Indeed, Michael Manley's friendship with Castro, his efforts at establishing links with Moscow, his high profiled position in the Socialist International, the regard that other radical Third World leaders had for him and his rhetoric of socialism, coloured by references to the inequalities of his society, were all seen as an alliance with communism. In Jamaica, communism as an ideology, was always regarded as an enemy both of the people (Bustamante's version) and of the finest values of bourgeois democracy. This latter view was typified by the PNP moderates who expelled the leftist gang of four, the Four H's, in 1952.

Over and above all this penchant for an ideology that worked against his class interest, Michael Manley was seen as being too close to the black scions of the lower class. These were the young ghetto politicians and the egg head leftist intellectuals in the Faculty of Social Sciences at UWI (Mona). Many of these persons became prominent and influential as ministers of government, advisors, consultants and even members of the Public Service. A statement such as

> "he became a captive of the left"
> (Appendix 1, p. 318)

is a summarizing theme of the general attitudes of his class and of his detractors to the perceived influence of a group of new comers to the political arena.

In this context Rex Nettleford who is the island's leading philosopher and thinker and regarded as progressive and radical in his stand on race, colour, Rastafarianism and national identity but barely liberal in his political views was regarded as dangerously anti-middle class when he served in the capacity of cultural advisor to Michael Manley's government. Paradoxically, Nettleford also worked closely with the present Prime Minister, Mr. Seaga, on cultural affairs during the sixties. At that time Mr. Seaga was also feared and distrusted by the traditional middle class not only as an outsider (the Lebanese) but as a glorifier of black culture and values. These values were manifested in revivalism, pocomania, kumina, ghetto life-style, ska and rocksteady (musical forms). These were aspects of Jamaican culture that Mr. Seaga studied and promoted in his effort to reaffirm the dignity of the masses. To the other end of the scale is the Workers' Party of Jamaica, lead by Dr. Trevor Munroe. This party gave critical support to Michael Manley and to aspects of the PNP programs. The strongest links in this alliance were those between the WPJ and the PNP youth movement. This movement was aggressively Left and anti-imperialist in its rhetoric. These linkages created further suspicion of Michael Manley's motives and world view and by 1980 he was almost totally alienated from the middle and upper classes.

Of minor importance, but of importance nevertheless, was his marriage to a black lower middle- class woman who was not regarded as socially acceptable by the women of his class. This decision on his part was just not perceived as a betrayal of his class but an offront to the very core of the psyche of the middle and upper class light-skinned, straight-haired woman. What Michael Manley had done was to put into the slot of first lady a woman who epitomized the strengths (physical and intellectual) of the caste that was seen as less desirable on the complex aesthetics of male-female interaction in the Jamaican society.

The following remarks are reflections of a rather complex set of societal attitudes and contradictions:

> SIMMS: You are, however, convinced that there was a class resistance to the idea of him marrying you?
>
> FAMILY MEMBER A: Yes, there was resistance from the browns. They were upset. I am sure they would have been happier if he had married a Matalon or a Henriques. And of course they were correct because such an alliance would have served their interest.
>
> SIMMS: What kind of image did you attempt to project to the majority of Jamaican women?
>
> FAMILY MEMBER A: I can remember the shock waves that went through the society when I decided to wear my hair in an Afro or when I went to an official function dressed in pants.... I can also remember that when we first got into office you could count the number of women who wore Afros. After I started wearing my hair in that style, in the space of a year the Afro became the dominant hair style. Along with this came a change in the style of dressing. The African theme, the roots look, surfaced. It was almost as if the African part of our culture was coming into its own because the people had a symbol....
>
> (Appendix 1, pp. 383-384)
>
> SIMMS: Some people say that with your wife Beverly by your side you brought a new image to Jamaica House. In other words, she assisted in projecting a new image of Jamaican womanhood. Were you conscious of this symbolism?
>
> MANLEY: Well, this is only significant in that I fell in love with her and I married her because she is a fantastic woman.... In spite of this, some people saw the marriage as something else, perhaps because Beverly is such an extraordinary woman, and because she proceeded to carve out a role of dynamism, activity and style which must have been a marvelous experience for the Jamaican women. In her, the majority could see a woman not born of the upper class--a black Jamaican woman--carrying the role of First Lady with style, dynamism and originality. This was indeed a throwing down of the gauntlet to the power structure though it was never meant to be.
>
> (Chapter VI, p. 182)

The totality of the middle class disaffection was implied by Nettleford (1978) in his assessment of the responses to the art forms aimed at cultural renewal:

> That the party in power which had a tradition of support of and for the middle strata should betray its own class with the proletarianization of culture, is seen by certain of the middle strata as one of the unforgivable sins, pardonable if committed by the old Jamaican Labour Party which anyhow did pander to be the headless mass but intolerable coming from the People's National Party. For was it not this party that gave Jamaica not only its vision of self-determination and the legendary intelligence of N.W. Manley, but also the touch of class which that founding father is supposed to have brought to public life for some thirty years? Only now it was being betrayed by his populist-politician son (p. 49).

Such responses are testament to the fact that the ethos of Jamaica, despite its strong lower class black reality, is Eurocentric and remains in the Anglo-Saxon mold to find form in the hankering for a certain idealized type of language, religion, kinship pattern (nuclear married life despite matriarchal extended family forms), artistic manifestation (music, dance, art, etc. still depend on European models despite the resurgence of African aesthetic). The search for the essence of the society in forms external to the people's lived experience is the result of four centuries of European domination. This domination permeates on all levels of the Jamaican psyche.

Politicians who dismiss the dialectic of caste, class and colour and seek instead to dogmatically project a society that can be unified solely through a more equitable distribution of goods will always be frustrated by the resistance to change from all classes.

Revolutionary transformation in Jamaica must take into account the tradition of survival among the masses. Neither the nationalism of N.W. Manley, the socialism of Michael Manley nor Mr. Seaga's free enterprise have been able to do this. Resistance to authority is imbedded in the psychic inheritance from slavery and this resistance works against the native leaders as it did against planters and colonial governors. The Jamaican masses intuitively know that they seek redemption from an oppressive system that on the more immediate level robs them of the basic necessities of modern living. But on the deeper level of the psyche this system has robbed them of their right to assert that which is authentic.

As long as the structural realities of the economy, politics and culture serve to marginalize the masses, resistance to change will come naturally even when decisions are taken in the name of the masses and in their interest.

CHAPTER VI

MICHAEL MANLEY SPEAKS OF HIMSELF

Introduction

When Michael Manley speaks of himself, his experiences, his visions of the future and the conditions of his society, he reveals a personality type distinguished and driven by that quality which is loosely called the missionary zeal--not in the prejorative connotation of the term but in the passionate commitment to ideas and concepts. This passion for ideas and the clarity with which this is enunciated are bolstered by his personal attributes of good looks and dynamism. These are qualities which cannot be missed by anyone who interacts with him either in a crowd or on a one to one basis.

In this interview, Michael Manley elaborates on the world view reflected in his belief system, the contradictions of class and caste within his society, his personal development, his attempts at reform and the lessons that he has learnt from his eight years as Prime Minister of Jamaica.

In his book Politics of Change which was published in 1974 he identified three groups of men who deal with politics (the business of power), and he placed himself in the group which he defined as the idealist--that politician who "seeks first a moral foundation for political action" (p. 16). This moral foundation--"a single touchstone of right and wrong" was his notion of Equality. In 1983 Michael Manley still holds Equality as a sacred value and admits that at a very early stage in his development he could sense the subtle and not so subtle injurious effects of the injustice of the Jamaican class structure. It is this that propelled him to action in the past and it is this that will propel him to further action in the future.

The questions that were posed to him in this discussion were informed by the responses of both his supporters and his opponents. As such, his reaction to the issues raised are inportant to an understanding of how these affected him as an individual and how these experiences will determine what he does in the future. Like most of the other interviews this one is distinguished by a lengthy opening statement of philosophy and world view.

The Interview

MANLEY: It is very difficult to be objective about oneself--very difficult to see oneself from outside, but if I might be excused a subjective account of one aspect of myself--it is that almost as far back as I can remember I have been driven by a sense of/or a response to, the notion of Equality.[1] I think temperamentally I find it very difficult to deal with Form and Hypocrisy. I don't mean about having good manners, but about holding out the sort of forms about ideas by which a man will say, "I am a Democrat", but if you really scratch under the skin he doesn't even know what he means by that.

I tend to have a very literal mind about concepts and either reject them because I don't like them, or I want to explore them in a deep way so that they are real. That is just something about my make-up. I am like that. If you add that characteristic to this deep emotional sense about Equality, I think that you get two important driving forces that interact on each other in my mind--with the result that I can remember from very young becoming conscious of the deep stratification of Jamaican society--the pre-assigned roles to the ruling class, the middle class, the working class and the peasants etc.--noticing that never could one class enter the front door of another class, but another class had the right to enter any door that they liked--noticing these deeply inbuilt injustices that are the consequence of a highly stratified class system. I can remember that, as a very young person, I would look at this and just react with anger, realizing that this can't be right. I think that a very powerful influence--I suspect in all that in me--was my Mother who, without being an intellectual egalitarian, is a profoundly instinctive one. All my life I have watched my mother surrounded by people who had a sort of equality of access to her--to her affections, to her verandah, to her conversation, to her gifts--and she never ever tended to live within a class and then reach out with condescending charity to some other class. My mother never did that. Once my mother was interested in you, you are just a person. I suppose this may have been a very deep unconscious influence, watching this as a youngster at a very impressionable age--maybe that's part of it.

---

[1] In this interview I have underlined words and phrases for emphasis.

I suppose that the tendency to Intense Commitments to Things--the Reality of Things rather than the Shadow and the Form of Things--may have come from the influence of a Father of very Profound Integrity, which obviously is something one would have been aware of, growing up with a very serious man, a man with very serious commitment in life. Such a man my Dad was.

I would have to say that these must have been two, somewhat different, but presumably formative influences at that stage. Another interesting comment that I can make--again purely subjective--was how in all the early instinctive attraction of Socialism to me, it was always the notion of equality that appealed most to me. At the root of the Socialist idea was the challenge of how you operationalize the notion of equality in the organization of a society and its economy, etc., etc. So that when one became older and began to get into the question of how one would express these ideas in one's life, it has never surprised me in retrospect, that with nothing whatsoever in my background that would make one think that I would become a Trade Unionist, the minute the opportunity to become involved in unions presented itself (because of the historical accident of the quarrel in the PNP in 1952), and the attempt to reform a Trade Union whose leadership was shattered by the quarrel--thus creating a vacuum, I was asked to do a few things in trade unionism. I took to this like a duck to water. It is as if this was expressing everything that I was dying to express--to fight for the workers for a more just relationship in the workplace. People who knew me then know that for twenty years I worked eighteen hours a day, seven days per week, with utter committed enthusiasm. The enthusiasm of someone who was getting very little pay, was mostly in debt, had nothing at that stage (and just didn't give a damn). I was so self-fulfilled to work as a Trade Unionist. I can hardly express this state--it was just a Glory Chapter in my life because it was expressing something.

It always interested me that looking back at that time, I recognize that, although I would fight with honesty and ability for workers' wages and made some very real contributions to revolutionizing concepts of wages in Jamaica (exemplified by what we did with the bauxite workers), when I really got turned on was when a worker was wrongfully dismissed or when I felt that a worker was having his Rights (not his money but his Rights) trampled by the power of the capitalist system and the hierarchical authority structure in the system. This I not only rejected intellectually but found myself willing to fight, willing to go to prison, to express my resentment of systems that are purely hierarchical and that have arbitrary systems of authority. All of this to me are complete denials of the notion of equality.

My notion of equality expresses itself in this way: If a person is to take an order, it must be because of a highly rational division of function in which somebody has to weigh factors and decide "let's do this". A person can accept an order in this framework--a framework of highly principled structured relationship, in which rights are immaculately preserved. That's my own concept of a just system. It is not a simplicity of believing that everyone is equal; of course everybody is not equal. Nor is it a belief that everyone can be managers; of course everyone can't be a manager. My feeling is that the idea of equality expresses itself in the Rationality of the division of labour and the division of functions must be rational, not arbitrary, and Power must be used within such a system--within strict limits--or equality is denied. In short, if my access to justice in this society is less than yours, if your power over me is not systematic and rational but has an arbitrary element, then the society is an unjust one.

As I grew up, this is how the ideas of equality expressed themselves to me. I never got any of this theory from my mother or my father. They never talked about things like these. This synthesis was an adult me--exploring through university days, exploring through my trade union experiences, how these driving forces in myself reflected themselves in ideas of society, social structures and all the rest of it. So that when one came later to politics (no, let me be clear about this) one was always deeply interested in politics because one's intellect told one that it is within the political process that these things are finally determined, adjusted, changed or conserved, depending on what forces are at work. However, I really never intended to get into a political career at all. I really was genuinely 'sucked' into it by PNP people who thought that I could make a contribution. I went very reluctantly, actually, but once I went in, the whole man went in. All the experiences and the ideas that had formed out of the interaction of impulse, training and experiences, fashioned the basic ideas that I took to politics. These then expressed themselves in the feeling that I was always a believer in Democracy, becuase it is the only framework, I feel, that expresses in operational terms my notion of equality.

If people do not have equal access to power through Democracy, then they are not equal. To me, Democracy is ACCESS. It is not a matter of people voting every five years--that is just a mechanism that one happens to use. To me, Democracy is a matter of maximizing the individual human being's access to power, access to the decision making process. I therefore see Democracy dealing with central governments and the power of the State, dealing with local governments and the power of local government authorities, dealing with communities (for instance, how students relate to the authority of their schools and, similarly, how teachers relate to the authority of their principals, and how parents fit into a whole process of self determination within the school experience, and how the workers relate to authority in the workplace). Democracy is experienced when communities create their own little system of power, within which they can decide on matters such as recreational, health and educational facilities and all the related areas that affect their lives.

I see Democracy as a total ferment, through which access exists to each individual to realize his or her potential, by being able to influence the decision making of their environment. That really sums up my philosophy and how I arrived at it. It has nothing to do about "what kind of leadership one gives", but that's me--that's me, aged 59--after all the early conditioning, training and experience.

In coming into the political process, a lot of my attitudes have been conditioned by my experience of class relationships as a trade unionist. So I see political leadership, the whole sort of political process, as being concerned on the one hand with ensuring that a society could continue to function granted its existing social structure, granted its existing power relationships, granted its modes of production and organization of production, etc., but at the same time, how to begin to develop, first of all, the understanding and secondly, the experience that would give effect to egalitarian democratization of society, and I have absolutely no apologies about it. I am absolutely clear in my mind about what I was trying to do at all stages. I do not say that I did it well but I know what I am trying to do. I never ever was fumbling in my mind. I had complete certainty about what I was trying to do, and what I was trying to do can really be summed up very simply: locally, I was trying to deepen the democratic process by all the experiments in democracy in the schools, the experiments in the community councils, the experiments with worker participation, etc., creating greater autonomy for local government authorities, etc. Within our party--I had inherited from my father a profoundly committed democratic party but I actually worked very hard to deepen the democratic process within the PNP to ensure that its decision making was profoundly democratic; that we never took any major decision that was not discussed right down into the grass roots levels and brought back up through the structure till final decisions were taken; to make sure that I myself never led autocratically by just saying, "that's the thing to do", and everyone falling in ranks behind me. Every idea that I had was meticulously discussed and sifted and thrashed out throughout the party as much as possible, though 90% of the time it would end up being what I thought was right. Now, maybe that's influence, or maybe the idea was right, I am not sure--maybe a little bit of both--but the fact is that I did try to express this and still do, within the party itself.

In foreign policy, the same thing too. The reason they cannot 'back me down' over Cuba is the day they 'back me down' over Cuba, I have given up the equal right of this little sovereign Jamaican nation to choose its friends, and if I never see Jamaica House again it does not matter to me. I will not agree ever to desert Cuba, not because I am a communist, because obviously I am not; not because I want communism, obviously I don't, but because I believe in Cuba's right to exist and I do not believe in America's right to tell me who my friends should be, and to me it is as simple as that. If I cannot do that, I am not equal in my sovereignty in the United Nations.

Even the foreign policy, even the Third Worldism is all to do with a highly developed view of how small countries have to express their equal right to equal access to the world economy by uniting, by building bridges across each other ideologically so as to confront the powers with the assertion of our equal right to trade fairly and have access to money fairly. To me it is all part of the same thing. All are completely consistent--from foreign policy down to whether school children should have a little committee to which they elect people to run their class along with the teacher, because I think that's how you train people to understand the democratic experience.

Now in the Jamaican society, what you are dealing with is one of the most highly stubborn class stratified societies. The mind boggles at the nature of the Jamaican class structure and there is an interesting thing about Jamaica, and that is the extent to which the society lived and still lives at two levels--one level at which everybody pretends that they accept the class structure and the other level at which they profoundly resent it if they are of the lower class, and are profoundly jealous of it if they are the upper class, and are willing to fight, and if necessary kill, before they lose it. So that I realize that one of the things that I misjudged (and I am perfectly free in my confession of this) was the extent to which people would be hostile when it began to dawn on them that I was consciously trying to alter the power equation in an egalitarian direction--which was perfectly reasonable. They expressed great shock and horror--"How does this man who just said he was a Democrat come now to try and disturb the power relationships?" Because obviously Democrats (of the illusion and form kind as opposed to the committed kind) use the democratic process to maintain the power structure. What they do is they all manipulate participation and voting and then everyone goes to sleep for five years, so as to make sure that the power structure is never troubled. "Here is this facety man now coming to use the democratic process to upset the power structure". Consciously, deliberately telling them he was doing it, though putting it in a polite way, saying to people, "Surely, since we are all God's children, people all, then we ought to be glad to share, etc., etc." But nonetheless doing it. And what really, I admit, took me somewhat by surprise was not that they would resist (of course I knew that they would resist), but the depth of the Passion and Hatred and sense of Betrayal that they bestowed on my head for daring to do this thing--a sense of class betrayal because I suppose, you know, I am a brown man, not actually a black man, and I come from a great luminary leader as a father. I am supposed to defend the system but I reached a certain stage when I turned to the people talking to me and said, "But how could you think that I would do anything else? What the hell do you think a person with my background, general experience and university training would do--entering the trade union to work eighteen hours a day, to take tear gas twenty, thirty times in his life, to be put in jail for a couple of days at least twice in his life...?" I said, "What do you think made me do that? If it was not that I don't accept the power structure, why would I do that?" "Well, we never thought of it." Even when I spent the whole of my life fighting for workers on the picket lines--fighting for their rights, not just fighting for money; trying to alter their power relationships, to give them grievance procedures for worker participation. That was my struggle--mobilizing the workers running a democratic union which could never move without going back to the workers to hear how to vote, all of which shows what I believe in. They watched the whole of this for twenty years and invented another Michael Manley. When they all voted for me--of so many classes--they invented a 'little John Kennedy'. They thought I was going to be 'little pretty boy' to do little 'shadow games' and leave the system untouched, so there was this deep sense of horror and betrayal in spite of all the evidence of my trade union life, in the feeling that in challenging the power structure I was, in fact, betraying them.

Watching the class reaction is really very interesting because on the one hand you get this theme of betrayal because they thought I was something else. They all say how I had this golden opportunity such as no other leader has ever had in his life. Jamaica would have done whatever I wanted. What they mean is that I would have done whatever they wanted if I asked them what to do. I have looked at that with such a profound amusement--the way in which they rationalize their problem and blame it on me, the one who could have done 'whatever he wanted'. This was total nonsense. Another thing that I have watched with interest is how they pretend that it is ideology that caused the trouble, but I have taken the trouble to study the migration statistics and the first big wave of migration out of Jamaica in reaction to policies of mine came before we declared Democratic Socialism, and was right after the announcement of wealth taxes and the National Youth Service. The thing that really got them upset first of all was that we found out that hardly anybody ever paid income tax. Someone could have a home worth a million dollars in Beverly Hills, but never paid income tax because the accountants 'cooked' the books so that they would be recorded as having no income. So we decided that the only way to be just and to create a tax structure that really dealt with wealth and the inequality of wealth in this society was to tax the wealth itself. So that if you had a huge home, tax would be placed on this as a way of getting at all the tax that they were not paying by these devices. And there was the most bitter resentment of that and anger, and people saw this as a sense of invasion--terrible.

At the same time we announced the National Youth Service and said quite frankly that we wanted everybody--rich and poor--to have their children serve, say a year, in national service where they would learn to live together and mix with others from the different classes and have some sense of patriotic contribution. The wealth taxes caused a rage amongst the men and National Youth Service caused the rage amongst the women. "My little Patricia is to go and rub shoulders with some nasty little girl from Trenchtown?" And the migration started. So there you saw that very interesting phenomena of responding to something that touched the privileged and therefore involved a threat to their power. And them responding violently--in most violent way you can--to tear yourself up from your home and live somewhere else--an almost rape of your identity as a human being, so angry are you that anybody could come and threaten all this. All that was extremely interesting.

Later on, of course, you got the situation being confused by the use of the Opposition under Seaga to suggest that everything I was doing was communist and that the relationship with Cuba (which was just one of many Third World relationships, it wasn't anything special in and of itself) was the evidence of communism. So what at first expressed itself as anger about politics that were challenging the power structure, each one of which was in fact democratic (intensely democratic and egalitarian) soon became a matter that this was really the secret to the communist agenda and part of the international communist conspiracy.

The truth is that they were anxious to find a way to rationalize their own resentment and find a peg to hang it on, to make them feel virtuous, because they were not now fighting a threat to their power but fighting the 'creeping cancer of communism'. Now everyone can defend his privilege with a sense of self-righteousness if he claims that the threat is the communist and not the democratic threat from the dynamics of his own societal force. Thus one can see the subtlety of what they did, and Seaga--ever the sociologist--reads that perfectly clearly, and knows that he has to hammer, hammer, hammer at communism, communism, communism so that they can feel virtuous in their resistance.

The trouble is that he used that theme and created hysteria to the point where they ended up by condoning killing and violence. When Seaga let loose the mayhem on this country in which 750 people died in six months by violence on the streets (some of our people fought back, but it was mostly our people who were killed), he was the aggressor for all the obvious reasons. They never once batted an eye. They were killing communists, therefore it was perfectly all right, it was as respectable as sending England to defeat Hitler. Fascinating to watch the capacity of the ruling class to set up every kind of camouflage and subterfuge to conceal one simple thing--"I ain't giving up power without a fight". It was really deeply interesting and revealing--of course you know what all ruling classes are like. It really isn't just the Jamaican. It's just that Jamaica has had a peculiar gift--a very British gift actually, which I am sure is part of the British colonial influence--that gift of living within a class structure that is seething with resentments by putting a veneer of respectability on it. In this, everybody says, "That's how the natural order is"--from the Queen (the symbolism of the monarch). She is the cementing symbol to make people accept the idea of a stratified class structure. If one can accept the idea of a hereditary monarch, then you have accepted arbitrary status with their arbitrary determination of status by birth, and then it is easy to accept an aristocracy which is her people, and a middle class and a working class because you made the first leap in your mind of accepting, through a sort of mysticism, the idea of a monarch. And that's all part of why Jamaica is like this. (Who freed the slaves? Queen Victoria in her kindness gave us our freedom. Who did we have to come and rescue us after that wicked fellow Bogle came and upset things? Queen Victoria came and settled the whole thing for us.)

So from then they worked their magic on the people so that even the people that were trapped within the class and resentful themselves are somewhat mystified by the whole experience, which they partly accepted. One of the things which I set out consciously to do was to challenge them to see that they were accepting a status that was wrong and I did that as a humanist and as a politician. Who said that you must live powerless and defenseless at the bottom of society?

SIMMS: Is the veneeer of respectability the reason why race has not been directly dealt with in any analysis of Jamaican society?

MANLEY: If you raise race as an issue, then "you are a wicked fellow who is stirring up the mass to hatred"--that's partly why. The other reason is that some of the steam is taken out of that situation by the fact that we don't run a rigid race line. There is racial mobility, enough token racial mobility to keep alive the notion that we are not really a racist society, but we are a racist society because the equation between class and race is so tight, the hostility between the two so complete, and the lines drawn so sharply that the fact that there is some upward mobility between classes propelling some black people upwards doesn't in my view qualify the reality. I think the reality is what it is but not a la America, and of course, not a la South Africa. These are far different expressions of that kind of thing. But it's all to do with the fact that in making speeches about equality, "the wicked thing that Michael did to Jamaica was to stir up the masses who were happy in their lot. They loved being at the bottom of the pile and if he didn't come and give them this idea and therefore start all this violence and trouble everything would be fine". In the end the ones who started the violence were blameless because the masses no longer knew their place.

SIMMS: While they felt very threatened by the threat to their class, the majority saw what you were doing as the first liberating force since emancipation. Did you realize that the masses were responding in that way?

MANLEY: I never thought consciously of it. I never sat down and said, "Ha, ha, now I have the masses!" I never approach life in that way. I am a person of very intense and passionate commitments and if those relate to things that people feel, I really didn't set out to get them, it's because I felt something was unjust--I am very open about it, and I am a rebel. Maybe that's one of my problems and maybe I shouldn't have got into politics--I don't know. I am a rebel at heart in the sense that I do not accept things as they are.

SIMMS: Did your Jamaica College experience as a schoolboy and your challenge to the school's authority form a part of the rebellious spirit?

MANLEY: That was an early expression. I just was that way.

SIMMS: When others are asked what your greatest contribution to Jamaica's political development is, they emphasize the fact that you had given the masses a sense of themselves as somebody. How do you respond to this assessment of your contribution?

MANLEY: I have heard people say that. I have no way of judging whether that's an accurate assessment. I myself think it is an exaggerated assessment because it didn't last very long. Maybe it did. I don't know. I am not sure.

SIMMS: Is the present system pushing back what gains were made?

MANLEY: All pushed back. All the old things that we were trying to replace are brought forward again, supported by a massive propaganda and manipulation. I don't know. One sometimes is forced to question whether one has made any contribution at all. You try, you fight for the things you believe in and you try to mobilize people to realize how much they are themselves. One of the things I remember most vividly was the first time I ever went to the Caymanas Sugar Estate, having won a poll and having the right to walk in to represent the workers, and I saw the boss--this little white guy from some other Caribbean island--approached by a worker who was wearing a cap. He proceeded to "bawl the hell out" of the worker, "How dare you speak to anybody like that? Who do you think you are?" I took him up into the office and said, "You never dare do that again or I will shut this estate down". I was in such a rage I was almost shaking to pieces--that one man believed that his relationship gave him the power over another man to talk to him like that (outdoors, not in church or in some other place given to convention). This sort of thing, and the fact that the worker was so cowed that even after fifteen years of unionism he has not yet begun to feel that he has a right to stand up and talk to the boss as a man (the right that every North American would take for granted).

All one hopes is that this might change by just working with people and saying, "Be strong, be proud of yourself". There may be a little of this. If a little of this has survived, I won't feel my life has been a total failure.

SIMMS: One of the criticisms of your style and leadership is that in order to balance the interests of competing groups, you waffled on some very crucial issues. Do you care to comment on this?

MANLEY: Well, recently you will note that I did not waffle on the election issue which to me was a fundamental issue of principle. All the things they have accused me of waffling on were really issues of economic judgement, e.g., how to cooperate with the private sector. I don't claim to have done anything particularly well, but I know that a lot of the decisions were extremely difficult and were not based on principled roads, they were just pragmatic judgements. For instance, how do you keep the whole thing from falling apart? You have to co-operate with the private sector. After all, the whole philosophy admits that they have a role in the process. Therefore, you have to make compromises with them even if they are being damned difficult to deal with, because they are part of your system. Then people get up and say, "He allowed the private sector to push him around".

I never ask workers to die for money. I ask them to die for principles. I always try to avoid a strike over money. I always say to myself, "What is money?" I don't think anybody ever gets the size of increases that he wants. I was a damn good negotiator, but I always tried to keep the workers from mashing up their lives about money, because in winning an increase of three more per cent they might go out on the picket lines and starve for eight weeks. This loss might take five years before it can be recouped. Those are pragmatic equations, but touching on principles. I would call on the workers to sacrifice on a simple principle. For instance, we led the JBC strike for ninety-seven days because two men were fired and were not given a hearing.

SIMMS: You are operating in a very democratic structure within the PNP. Yet in spite of the fact that leadership is shared you stand a great distance from all others in the structure, and you are still the leader to which the majority of your supporters look. Has Democratic Socialism run its course and will you have to reformulate your theories in order to have the same impact that you have had while you were in office? Or, on the other hand, will you pursue Democratic Socialism in a more determined way now that you have the advantage of learning so much from your experiences?

MANLEY: I think the latter, definitely, but not so much about more determination. God knows we have been determined before. I would say we will, in a more experienced way. The thing that is lacking in all of this is that because of certain problems within the PNP--its history and so on and so forth--we have not adequately developed cadre understanding. We are not leading a party with a commitment to Democratic Socialism that came out of profound study--that marriage of study and experience which makes a person committed. All of my commitments are partly experience, but also because there is a very substantial framework of study which I got at my father's knee, as a boy growing up and reading the books, and later at university and by continuing to read. So that there is some intellectual and philosophical framework against which my experience interacts. I have always been very conscious of the fact that to the extent that I have deep commitment to certain ideas, it is because of an interaction of experience and idea, that is, an intellectual discipline plus an existentialist concept of experience. We really tried to get the party to be a vehicle of a philosophy and ideology because we thought it was right, but without giving the party adequate time to assimilate what it was all about, so that they too could have an intellectual framework within which to deal with their experience and carry out their action, etc. So that is one reason why, for the past three years, we have worked particularly hard to establish a political education program and process within the party. This will slowly begin to develop a widening circle of committed cadres in intellectual terms. They, in turn, will be able to give leadership in the communities and in the state or wherever thy happen to be. They will be able to do this because they would have had a deep understanding of where the ideas of Democratic Socialism are coming from in historical experience. So it is really in how to make the party an intellectually competent people for all of this, that the difference has to be found. When one is not sufficiently committed, one makes mistakes, one becomes an adventurist, timid or vacillatory and when one runs into resistance one is tempted to react by saying, "Jesus Christ, I wonder if I was wrong?" instead of knowing that you are right but must expect resistance because you are right. We have had the experience of some very immature reactions by members and sectors of our party because of this lack of sufficient political education. We were immature in the sense of lacking in experience of a particular process--that is what immaturity is.

I have learnt lessons out of all of this and I am determined that if this is my last contribution to the PNP, then it is to get them not to run away from their ideas but to learn to prepare the understanding of the ideas. It is not the ideas that are wrong; it is our understanding of how to handle them that is wrong. I think I have won that fight in that the PNP has not surrendered its ideas, but is trying to found them more solidly in training and study--a very exciting process! You see, that is what is exciting--all this other business about scrambling for power when one doesn't have any ideas in one's head about what is to be done, just bores me to death. I would tell the PNP that, "anytime you find the politics of ideas too trying and difficult because they might land you into problems, just let me know and let me go to teach at Columbia or somewhere else, which I would be happy to do as an alternative". I really can't be bothered with politics if it is not about ideas and action--that is absolutely fundamental.

SIMMS: Even when you lost popularity at home, you remained internationally famous, especially in the eyes of the Third World. How do you account for this?

MANLEY: I don't know if it is true that I have that appeal internationally. I think some fans say that--which is very kind of them--but I think this is a wild exaggeration. However, whatever contribution I have made to the Third World has to do with the fact that one of the gifts that I have is the ability to take complex ideas and express them in terms of the essential components of the idea, so that even people who do not have a deep knowledge and exposure to these ideas can understand them. That is, really simplifying complex ideas to their essentials and then finding the language that explains them by relating these to people's experiences. What I always try to do is to get inside a person's experience by being sensitive to how people live. This is the same technique that novelists and playwrights and poets use. They learn to empathize with people and they become observant and by so doing they store memory of how people live and think and feel. All communication is about the business of taking an idea and, instead of getting all pompous and puffed up (beating your own little drum) take the idea and try to figure out (granted your audience) what the experience of the audience is, and then seek to find symbols in that experience, and through these express the idea. It may be, as we were saying earlier, that the idea may relate to deeply felt needs of the audience.

Maybe I was one of the first persons who came along in the Third World and happen to have this particular gift for looking at the problem of the Third World, simplifying it to essentials, getting it into some sort of conceptual framework and then finding the language that expresses what everybody knows--but maybe nobody else had put it quite so simply or quite so clearly. As a result of this, I have gained the quite undeserved reputation of being the "spokesman". I was no "spokesman" for the Third World; I was only the Prime Minister of Jamaica--and Jamaica is a "dot" on the map. However, I championed the problem of the Third World because I feel deeply about the Third World and I feel that our struggle is the struggle that has to be pursued as relentlessly as the internal struggle of Jamaica, because this is the international framework within which the different national struggles have to be supported. I was as relentless about this as I am about anything to which I am committed, and I always try to explain to the First World (in terms that they can understand) what this struggle is all about. I tried to let them see that this is not a rhetorical mystery in which orators try to bemuse and that they must try to understand in very simple human terms (that make sense in their own experience) that make sense in the Third World--the collective aspirations of our people.

SIMMS: Who were your mentors? You already mentioned your mother, who obviously had a great influence, but who else helped in your development?

MANLEY: Mother had a great influence on me. I profoundly admire her-- just as a human being, the way she lives out so many things that other people look at as remote ideas--Mother lives them and that is beautiful! Dad? I suppose! He was a patrician figure--a figure of awe and I had my share of awed respect for him. I also had a deep love and admiration for him. Laski--Laski was a very real influence on me. When I went to university, Professor Laski, one of the great apostles of Democratic Socialism, really put together some ideas about socialism and democracy. In this he was talking from his heart, but he wasn't just playing around with words. He really tried to put together an idea of how you could take socialist concepts that had come from the broad evolution of Socialism, including Marx (who is still the greatest thinker that Socialism has produced), and put these with another stream of thinking that had come through the great liberal democrats such as John Stuart Mill and others, in order to create a synthesis (an operational synthesis) between the two. I found this very, very important and these ideas are still the fountainhead of ideas from which I draw.

I was always profoundly struck by Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. who, I think, achieved revolutionary purposes in non-violent ways. I was always profoundly moved and, in much of my trade union work, I was happy with the way Martin Luther King approached problems. His style fitted my spirit and appealed to my emotions, because I abhor violence. I would have to be pushed very far before I could be involved in violence. I have a personal abhorrence of violence--and this is a fact of my life. I don't know where this revulsion comes from, but I really abhor violence. It upsets me profoundly. Unless one has to deal with a 'Baptista'--then and only then do I understand it. I understand revolution against utter degradation and tyranny, when there is no democratic way out. That I understand and I probably could do it if that were my situation. That apart--I abhor violence! Gandhi and King were therefore important influences in my life.

After saying all that, I still believe that the dominant influence in my life was my trade union experience. This was the formative thing and this is where the ideas were tested in action, and it is in this area that the society revealed itself to me. The twenty years in the trade union has been the greatest influence on me--much greater than my mother, my father, Gandhi, Laski, and Martin Luther King, Jr. That's the truth!

SIMMS: Some people think that in these twenty years you demonstrated your greatest strength--that of negotiation. How do you respond to this?

MANLEY: They say I was a good negotiator and I think that this was so because I inherited from my father all the advocate skills. (I know I am a good advocate, although I didn't take up law because I didn't want to compete with his reputation. Anything rather than that!) I suppose I was effective also because I have what is commonly called multiple concentration. I have an almost photographic memory. I can carry an enormous mass of data in my mind and I can keep all this sorted out. I am used to carrying a great number of negotiations at the same time, and I would move from Desnoes and Geddes to the Bauxite Company to the Waterfront and then to Caymanas Sugar Estate, and still have each case clear in my mind. Mark you, that's no unusual feat, it is just like a person who can run very fast. It is not difficult, the person is just adapted to run fast.

SIMMS: Some people say that with your present wife Beverly by your side you brought a new image to Jamaica House. In other words, she assisted in projecting a new image of Jamaican womanhood. Were you conscious of this symbolism?

MANLEY: Well, this is only significant in that I fell in love with her and I married her because she is a fantastic woman. It may be that people perceived this marriage in a certain way, however I married her because I loved her and felt that I needed her. After the death of Barbara, my previous wife, I had the choice of spending out the rest of my life as a heartbroken recluse or to live again. I wasn't sure which choice I would have made until I met Beverly--I decided to live again. It was as simple as that.

In spite of this, some people saw the marriage as something else, perhaps because Beverly is such an extraordinary woman, and because she proceeded to carve out a role of dynamism, activity and style which must have been a marvelous experience for Jamaican women. In her, the majortiy could see a woman, not born of the upper class--a black Jamaican woman-- carrying the role of First Lady with style, dynamism and originality. This was indeed a "throwing down of the gauntlet to the power structure" though it was never meant to be. I married her as a wife, I did not marry her to make a political point. I need to say this just in case there be any misunderstanding of our motives.

Because Beverly is an extraordinary woman in her own rights, she created a symbolism which was upsetting to the power structure. She has been a great source of pride and inspiration to the masses--especially the women. In this respect, she has been an "unintended fringe benefit" to my career--not a planned thing, but it happened.

However, that is the other thing about life. People (men, women) join movements and both men and women find some leaders who they were waiting for at the moment in time while there are many who never find what they are looking for.

SIMMS: If Jamaica is ready for you, Mr. Manley, would you be ready for Jamaica?

MANLEY: I don't know. Who is ever ready for anything in life? You are as ready as you can be. You try to learn by what you have been through. I think I have learned a lot of things from the first eight years--some mistakes that we made and why things went wrong. I can only hope that I have the capacity to have drawn some correct conclusions from that period. I think I have drawn conclusions that would affect how I would do the second time around--the same principle, but the methodology would be better, more controlled and more deeply thought through, so that action and the reaction to action can be finally calculated in the political process. I can only pray that I am better ready--that's all I can say.

SIMMS: Your opponent, Mr. Seaga, is feared by many as an unknown factor. Do you share these fears?

MANLEY: There is a reason for such a reaction. It has an objective basis. It all began with how West Kingston was built--the act of the total destruction of the PNP and the bulldozing of homes, etc. Really, I don't want to say more except to reiterate that the fears come from the memory of how West Kingston became a monument to Mr. Seaga's power.

SIMMS: Thank you very much for allowing me to do this interview, Mr. Manley.

CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Introduction

To a great extent, direct observation of people and events has given me a unique perspective from which to understand what is happening in Jamaican society in the eighties. The interpretations would not have been possible without the insights of someone who has some insider knowledge of the Jamaican culture. As such, I was able to apprehend many of the meanings inherent in social interactions; tune into the nuances of meanings in what was said; get an understanding of the things unsaid and had a secret knowledge of those which must remain unsaid. Thus the texture of daily life was more easily captured and the totality of feelings and moods comprehended in ways that would elude even the most astute outsider. On the other hand, the insider perspective runs the risk of being textured by political alliances, social class perspectives and my inability to stand back from the issues. As such then, I have tried at all times to be conscious of both the strengths and weaknesses of any particular approach to the understanding of the human condition.

This study focuses on the perceptions of a group of significant political power brokers in the Jamaican society. They represent three main groups--family members, political opponents who support other parties, and supporters of the People's National Party. In order to substantiate the analysis of the interview data I attended the 45th Annual Conference of the PNP. This was held at the National Arena in

Kingston, Jamaica from September 21st-25th, 1983.

The 45th Annual PNP Conference (September 21-25, 1983)

The 45th Annual Conference of the People's National Party was held at a very politically volatile time in Jamaica. There were rumours being circulated in the society that the Prime Minister might call an early general election. This conference was therefore a getting together of the party executive and supporters in an effort at reconstruction and in an effort at clarifying ideological differences. The opening remarks by Michael Manley on the morning of September 21st, 1983 included a strong call for unity and for new future directions for the party.

Because of the shattering defeat at the polls in the 1980 elections the party had had a relatively low profile both in and out of Parliament. This low profile could have been the direct result of a once powerful party being humiliated and decimated and therefore incapable of quick recovery. It might also have been a period of soul searching on both the individual and group levels of the leader class within the party. Whatever the reason for their apparent low profile, this 45th conference was to become the party's first real public and ideological statement since the 1980 elections (even though they had had other conferences since the defeat).

In a sense then, this conference was particularly important, not just in the proposing of an ideological position but also for making a statement to a public which was fast becoming disillusioned and fed up with the economic vicissitudes of the JLP regime and Mr. Seaga's inability to give his promised deliverence. In fact, in 1983 deliverence was as far removed from the Jamaican masses as it ever was throughout their history.

Two aspects of the annual conference were significant to the findings of this study. One was the very democratic and well oiled party structure of the People's National Party. The other was the continued adoration that the masses still have for Michael Manley. This latter was clearly demonstrated at the public mass meeting which was held on the last day of the conference.

On this occasion the obvious hero worship of Michael Manley was dramatically displayed both by the masses and by the party machinery which prepared the well honed and well orchestrated proceedings that would enhance this adulation. As a newcomer to the scene I wondered if this kind of procedure was a deliberate effort for this particular occasion or if it is a unique political procedure in Jamaica. In other words, it might be that what was significant to me as an observer at the PNP conference might also be significant at the JLP conference--a sort of Jamaican political practice in form and procedure.

Very early in the day the National Arena was overcrowded with the thousands of people who had journeyed by various means from all points of the island to participate in this mass meeting. At the appointed time the PNP Members of Parliament and other leading figures in the party's hierarchy entered the arena at regular intervals. Each received the crowd's ovation as he or she came into view and proceeded to the platform. It was not difficult for even the most uninformed observer to identify those persons who were the most popular because the cheers that greeted each were not of the same magnitude and intensity.

During this procedure party songs with religious overtones were sung at regular intervals. (Appendix 11) These were very effective in getting the crowd into a mood of anticipation and they created a feverishly high pitched and excited atmosphere. In fact I can describe this as an atmosphere fit for a religious meeting. The song leader was, in Jamaican terms, a maternal figure and through her delivery and the power of her voice she appealed to the crowd in a way that only her physical presence could.

The maternal figure in the Jamaican society is the visibly black older mother type of person, one who could be the universal higgler (market vendor) and grandmother. She is not the miscegenated hybrid (discussed by Nettleford (1971) in Mirror, Mirror). This latter is the 'Miss Jamaica' image questioned by Moris Cargill in his article Beauty and the Beasts published in the Daily Gleaner (September 25, 1983). The use of the black maternal image on the stage at the PNP conference, especially as a stage setter for the leader's appearance and speech was an appeal both at the level of maternity and to solidarity. This woman symbolically became the black earth mother--the nanny and mother who historically raised and nurtured all (of whatever class or caste). Like her counterpart in Black American literature typified by works such as Gone With The Wind and Raisin In The Sun, she presented for her society the universal black female image of nurturance, struggle and survival.

This woman was counterbalanced on the PNP political platform by Mrs. Edna Manley who also occupied the centre stage and who, though white, symbolized the creative energies and aspirations of the struggling black masses. This she did through her art and through her role in the earlier political struggles. In other words, when Edna Manley married Norman Manley she absolutely (culturally and otherwise) seemed to have acculturated to a black society. By her role as wife of the most illustrious of the national heroes and mother of the present PNP leader, Edna Manley was integral to the duality of maternal images that must be presented to the Jamaican people as long as a Manley is still the leader of the PNP and as long as she is physically able to do so.

Both women touched the psychological underpinnings of the nation and in an atmosphere fraught with messianic overtones the duality of images was very important. The juxtaposition of the two maternal figures--the white and the black, and the singing of spiritual songs was symbolic of the semi-religious overtones that typified Jamaican politics and Jamaican political leaders. All this was appealing to that core psychic foundation in the people's mind, namely the fact that religion is very important to Jamaican people at most levels. In fact it would be difficult to identify any level of the population that has left religion behind. As one interviewee pointed out, there is a proliferation of new American churches amongst the urban poor. This is a significant development in both social and religious teams.

It is perhaps only at the level of the "gun-man" lumpen-proletariat that one can seriously question the role of religious values. And yet it can be argued that these persons could quite likely use a logic that is based on religious morals in the use of violence to get their share of the material wealth that has constantly eluded them. The contradictions inherent in religion lend themselves to a deviant logic, especially in the most deviant times. However, this does not negate the fact that the basic underpinnings of the society is religious. It is this basic underpinning that Michael Manley appealed to when he invited the singer to sing a hymn between his introduction and his main address at the 45th annual conference. This act perfected the scene because the crowd had just been led in songs with words such as "Lead us Joshua, lead us, etc." and "You wrong to trouble Joshua, you wrong, Joshua is a lion, etc."

It is significant to note that the image being conjured up in 1983 was still the image used in 1972--the image of Joshua being asked to lead the Jamaican people to the promised land. Obviously the charisma which was lost in 1980 had resurfaced in 1983. This was the point that one interviewee made in the following question and answer:

> What happened to this charisma in 1980? If it disappeared, then it clearly cannot be equated to a physical appearance, or it cannot be equated to any style. It has to be equated to the perception of whether he has the ability to meet the needs of the masses of the people or not. Equality, if charisma disappeared on November 1st, 1980, how is it now reappearing in 1983? It is reappearing because of the perceived inability of the current leadership (Seaga and the JLP) to meet the needs of the people.
> (Appendix 1, p. 348)

I extrapolated from all this in concluding that Michael Manley's strength laid in precisely what has become the crisis for the Seaga government--namely the economic crisis which is clearly unsolvable by anyone, especially in the continuing pattern of dependence as discussed by Clive Thomas (1976) in his analysis of the economic dependence cycle. The wheel has come full circle in Michael Manley's favour because the international crises have made it impossible for Edward Seaga to continue in the traditional path of borrowing from the richer nations. The high interest rates and the terms of the IMF have all poor and Third World countries in a stranglehold. The most recent disturbances (April, 1984) in the Dominican Republic are yet another concrete statement on this issue.

In the case of Jamaica the situation is as immediate and as volatile. The anti-Manley platform that projected Jamaica as a violent and unstable society (chronicled by Michael Manley in his book Struggle in the Periphery) has now backfired. In power, the miracle of a Jamaica fit for the tourist to come back to; the 'Jamaica - No Problem' of the T-shirt and souvenir is a Jamaica of Mr. Seaga's imagination. 'Deliverance', a word with religious overtones, the 1980 slogan of the JLP has not come after nearly four years of more grinding poverty and higher levels of social dislocation.

Manley's 'Joshua' is rising from the ashes of the 1980 defeat, if the response of the crowds at the 1983 45th annual converence is to be seen as a clue to the mood of the supporters of the PNP. This conclusion, largely impressionistic and based on my assessment of crowd responses to the individual, has been reinforced by political commentator and analyst, Carl Stone in his article Third Party Talk published in the Daily Gleaner on March 5, 1984. In this article Stone argues that:

> ....in the worst days of the anti-PNP sentiments in the 1970's the middle class held on to a rejuvenated faith that Seaga and the JLP could restore sanity and sound leadership to a society that seemed to be drifting into the deep waters of confusion, hate, economic blight and hopelessness. After three years of Seaga's JLP, the faith has evaporated in the heat of disillusionment with the JLP, the policy failures as Seaga's mystique as a financial wizard has been savagely shredded by the adverse flow of economic events and circumstances.... But Jamaica is not a middle class society and most of its relatively uninformed voters still have faith in the PNP and JLP leaders and are unlikely to switch from a two-party pattern of loyalties to some new alternative political force.

In this analysis Stone lends credence to the argument that the conservative poor peasants who form the mass of the Jamaican population, will continue to seek redemption through the small group of middle class power brokers who have over time emerged and legitimized themselves as the most capable leader class. Effectively then, the followers are at this point in time unprepared psychologically to seek for alternative leaders and alternative solutions to the historical problems of underdevelopment. It is for these, and other less explicit reasons that Michael Manley will continue to offer to the Jamaican folk a ray of hope for the future.

Findings From The Interviews

The seventies was the appropriate time for Michael Manley to make his kind of impact on the Jamaican society. The dissatisfaction with the JLP at that time and the general sense of lack of direction made for a climate ready for someone who could give a different definition of development. No other Jamaican could have captured the mood. With all his personal and social attrubutes Michael Manley was the man of the moment. He was the only one who could represent all the needs of his society. Many of his supporters and opponents point out that he came to power in 1972, leading a multi-class alliance. He held out hope to everyone. He was indeed the Joshua of their imagination.

Ironically, as the process unfolded it became clear that the needs and visions of each layer of the Jamaican society were diametrically opposed to each other. The vision of the middle and monied classes was antithetical both to the vision of the poor and poverty stricken masses and to the aspirations of the workers in agriculture and industry. This is not to say that all did not hope for national betterment while they gained individual betterment. The point is that betterment could not come without substantial sacrifice on the part of those who had more to sacrifice. Time has proven that this attitude to sacrifice had not been developed, and eventually the dreams of Manley's seventies became a nightmare by 1980.

Both on the personal and societal levels Michael Manley's Joshua was a continuation of a cult environment that can be analyzed both in the history of his society and in the history of his development. On the societal level the hope for redemption manifested itself in messianic attempts typified through movements such as Bedwardism, Garveyism, Rastafarianism, Black Power, etc. On the personal level the following observation succinctly underlined the individual as a product of his unique developmental process:

> His need to be surrounded by adulation might be related to his background. He grew up in an examplary home with two outstanding parents and was always surrounded by troops of distinguished visitors. His home, Drumblair, became a shrine for the literati who grasped for alliance with the party. There was, therefore, a cult dimension to the environment in which Manley grew up.
> (Appendix 1, p. 345)

Michael Manley's Contributions To Jamaican Society

When the interviewees (of whatever tendency) are asked to assess Michael Manley's contribution to Jamaican political life, they all focused on his contribution to the masses. It is significant that no one mentioned the obvious though limited contributions to aspects of the material culture (rural electrification, highways, agriculture, etc.) They recognized instead his contributions in less tangible ways. The following are the many ways in which his contributions were captured:

> I would say that the Manley years were years when we lost our innocence. He changed the society radically. A large number of people who had slightly racist or even blatantly racist ideas or even ideas of themselves as a class had to come to grips with themselves.... It was the first time that most Jamaicans questioned whether they wanted to live in Jamaica....
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 326)

This loss of innocence is a metaphor for the threat that Manley's reforms posed to the class position of the middle and business classes. Having thrived in a society that accommodated their negative attitudes to the majortiy of the population, they resented all attempts that would cause this mass to assess its relationship to the numerical minority groups. As a representative of the middle and upper class interests this interviewee supported the notion that it is the god given right of his group to maintain their social position.

> In all this, he has had a tremendous influence on the society, especially on the youth. He caused them to question old values, but he did not help them to replace the old with the new.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 346)

> Michael Manley's greatest arena of brilliance was in the trade union movement.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 291)

> The concept of National Sovereignty is the key to Manley's leadership. If he has a place in Jamaica's history...it will be as the force in the establishment of the Nation as an integrated whole.
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 250)

> He is a distinctive Jamaican leader to the extent to which he has created in Jamaicans an awareness of themselves of their own importance....
>
> (Appendix 1, p. 255)

> The high level of politicization and mobilization that has surrounded his political life is noteworthy. He has also given a sense of dignity to the black people of Jamaica--a sense of dignity that, even in the face of resurging conservatism cannot be erased.
>
> (Appendix 1.)

Even those who distrust Michael Manley's motivations and his apparent connection with the power classes found it difficult to deny that as a leader he occupied a unique slot in Jamaica's political history. Everyone paid tribute to the fact that he has attempted to give dignity to the black people of his society. This dignity is a quality that cannot be measured in the short-term but it is part of the long-term vision of socio-political change and possibilities. Obviously, in a class-based society, this kind of contribution would be a threat to the status quo. With dignity and pride the masses cannot be expected to remain subservient and dependent (economically or psychologically), hence the very nature of class relationships will alter automatically on the important level of the psyche. No doubt economic dependence will be more resistant to such changes. However, the attitudinal change will make it very difficult for the traditional practices to continue without violent resistance on the part of the masses.

Contradictions

The contradictions of Manley's leadership style were one of the preoccupations of his supporters. In reviewing all their comments and concerns the most appropriate descriptor that characterizes his style is the term 'Balancing Act' which was used to define what happened when Manley attempted to translate ideology into practice. For instance, the question of translating a belief in participation into concrete terms begged the question of how democratic can Democratic Socialism be. Manley was committed to grassroots participation but he faced the problem of how to get a largely non-literate and unskilled population meaningfully engaged in the policies and strategies that were needed for social change. Many of these, by their very nature, were tedious and ponderous and could not be responded to in emotional terms. They must be attacked with a reasoned attitude informed by hard economic and social realities.

In spite of these operational problems, Manley demonstrated that he was committed to giving the masses a say. He therefore showed great patience in public forums such as conferences and he listened to what people had to say even if this meant cutting into time that was set aside for other important activities.

Some analyze this penchant for giving everyone a say (especially the working class speaker) as a form of paternalism and they argued that Manley would end up doing what he wanted to do despite the input of the masses. On the other hand, on a very literal level Manley's approach can be seen as that of someone trying to reserve the kind of passive recipient psychology developed through the colonial experience and reinforced by the teaching styles of the schools. Such a style is characteristic especially of the elementary schools that offer the sum total of the formal education of the majority of the masses. In this sense Michael Manley can be seen as very much determined to act out his spoken and stated ideological position:

> I see Democracy as a total ferment, through which access exists to each individual to realize his or her potential, by being able to influence the decision making of their environment.
>
> (Chapter VI, p. 164)

Michael Manley's approach was vital to his mass appeal because he catered to the appearance of a people who were in control even if in reality they had no control. He paid attention to their role in the process, not as an end in itself but as a model of possibility--an ideal and a desired goal. He also did not make his approach appear obviously as lip service to democracy because he came across to his audiences with an authenticity that reflected a genuine interest in people. This was an important aspect of his charismatic appeal. In other words, he gave the impression that he was a people person.

He genuinely wanted people to discuss and participate in issues so that he could downplay the strong leader role because he obviously came to recognize the power of the personality cult. Even though he emotionally thrived on adulation and attention, he intellectually comprehended the limitations to development that are part and parcel of this kind of the cult relationship.

Balancing was therefore an outcome of the social realities with which Michael Manley had to deal.

A sense of doubt and ambivalence marked many of the responses of Michael Manley's supporters and followers. Some were astute at nailing down the precise areas of weakness and strengths. Others simply felt that this was a man of many contradictions--perhaps too many. What was clear is that there seemed to be a pattern of emotional entanglements which may very well be buried in the subconscious. Many of the insights given spontaneously seemed to indicate that Manley is a leader of extreme magnetism on the wider level but is an individual who, on closer contact, inspires contradictory and ambivalent responses.

This kind of situation is perhaps typical of most persons. However, it becomes a dilemma for the public individual. Around such an individual there will always be a questioning of the private substance behind the public image, however scintillating or prophetic this image may be. Perhaps this dilemma is at the heart of many of the Jamaican voters who in 1984 feel that between Manley and Seaga there is no real choice, and many are truly open for another kind of leader. Stone discussed the almost desperate position of the middle class in 1984 in his recent editorial, Third Party Talk. He argued that:

> The political temperature among the Jamaican middle class has hardly been lower than it is at the moment. This class which carried such a weight of leadership responsibility in so many areas of our national life has begun to have deep doubts about the country's viability and future and is fast losing faith in the country's political leadership.
> (Daily Gleaner, March 5, 1984)

Jamaicans are not only talkers, they are thinkers. If Michael Manley gave them nothing else, he gave them an awareness of themselves that will always remain and will always catalyse the thought process even more than is obvious to the casual observer.

Criticisms of Manley's approaches were echoed in various forms even by some of the most conservative of his supporters. Generally it was felt that he did not take firm enough action at crucial points. However, this may be articulated, clearly people from all sorts of different perspectives saw Manley as a person who was attempting to please everybody and in so doing he made no single group in the society satisfied. In other words, the middle class was alienated, the business class was frustrated and most importantly the masses were disappointed and perhaps felt conned in the long run. Additionally, the intelligentsia felt betrayed because their advice was not heeded. A full treatment of the latter was given by Beckford and Witer (1981) in Small Garden Bitter Weed.

The increasing economic hardships and the devaluation of the

Jamaican dollar in the Fall of 1983 were the continuation of a process. The IMF syndrome becomes a metaphor for how one deals with international pressures--financial, political and ideological. Just as Manley would not or could not take a firm stance on the IMF, despite clear-cut advice from sectors of his technocrats, so also Seaga finds that the going is rough even when one is seen as a supporter of capitalism.

There were some blatant contradictions in Manley's personal style. He was described as one who is not a parliamentarian though he thrived on mass meetings; he was a good negotiator at the union table but he does not seem to be able to carry over his skill into his private life or in one to one relationships. Thus both in the highly private and personal, and in the public and political arenas one finds a sort of liberal two-sidedness. This dualism within the individual is an extension of the dualistic trend within the Jamaican psyche. After all, Anancy, the folkloric spider man figure always won by cunning and trickery rather than by hard work. He is no less a hero than Paul Bogle, the revolutionary national hero. Both are heroes and this indicates that within the Jamaican psyche there is a schizophrenic dimension to which Michael Manley appealed and to which he addressed himself successfully because he was speaking with the voice from that mass subconscious.

Within this analytic framework the class/colour dualisms and contradictions which were addressed by all interviewees are extensions of this psyche. This was discussed in the most eloquent terms by Rex Nettleford in Mirror, Mirror (1971) and in Identity, Race and Conflict (1978) and revealed in the most dramatic terms by Trevor Rhone (1981) in his play Old Story Time. These treatments of the dualisms and contradictions seem to say what observers are still saying--that Jamaica is still very much in the grip of a class/colour schizophrenia. As such then, what was seen as the liberal two-sidedness of Michael Manley may not after all be a political or personal weakness. It might well be a strength. It was what made him a popular and charismatic leader. He was able to straddle the devisive forces and addressed in a visceral way the guts of the people.

What must further be understood is that this two-sidedness created a conflict between Manley's own middle class/white Jamaican or mulatto roots and his commitment to the oppressed classes of his society. This conflict was addressed by all interviewees. This was a dilemma that Michael Manley had to address on a very personal level. If he is to succeed as an effective leader in the future, he must not only comprehend the contradictions, he must enunciate and concretely rectify what can be rectified.

Consistency of Belief System

Michael Manley's basic philosophy of development and societal change has not changed significantly from that which he espoused in the Politics of Change in 1974. The basic concepts to his belief system are those of Equality and Democracy, and the interaction of both is the guiding principle of his definition of Democratic Socialism.

The contradictions of the class struggle within the Jamaican society were experienced on several levels by Michael Manley. This has caused him to rededicate his energies to the liberation of the oppressed classes. In other words, he has come to the realization that it is futile to try to reconcile the oppressor with the oppressed.

The programs of the PNP under Michael Manley were sound and had the potential for effecting fundamental changes within the Jamaican society. Their failure or limitations were the consequence of mismanagement, lack of commitment, and sabotage. In other words, the class antagonisms were experienced in the unwillingness of some of the persons in the party, in the bureaucracy and government to carry out the mandate inherent in the programs.

A Mother's Influence

Edna Manley had and continues to have a great influence on Michael Manley. She is his mother, mentor, confidante and friend--a sort of power behind the throne. The ties that bind both are more than the social and biological. They are the cultural forces of contradiction and creativity.

Charisma: Some Thoughts and Definitions

Within the Jamaican context it was much easier and much more advisable perhaps, to omit and avoid the use of the word charisma in approaching the interviewees. I deliberately never used the word in the introduction and major probe. In light of this the consistency with which the word emerged in the interviews was significant. The words charisma and charismatic are recurring descriptors of Michael Manley by both his supporters and his opponents.

Interestingly then, when a sampling from both camps is taken, the following typify the conscious recognition of and admission to a quality that sets Michael Manley apart from others during his time as Prime Minister of Jamaica.

1) I am saying tht I do not accept the simplistic notions of charisma which do not explain anything but simply confess the inability to explain. Charisma is a relationship rather than material elements, so that for the leader who is said to be charismatic, charisma becomes a significant political factor only at that perceived to be helpful.
(Appendix 1, p. 348)

2) Seaga himself is not a charismatic person.
(Appendix 1, p. 341)

3) Manley has what is commonly called charisma.
(Appendix 1.)

4) I think there is no doubt that there is a charismatic component to his leadership.... However, charisma has to be validated and I think Manley has attempted to validate this by developing an ideology which is of central interest to the people--to their lives and possibilities.
(Appendix 1, p. 259)

5) In theological terms, Manley has the same symbolism for Jamaicans as Moses had for the Jews.
(Appendix 1, p. 250)

6) He is charismatic. He has a natural appeal, is a tremendous orator and a very principled person.
(Appendix 1, p. 253)

7) In this process of symbolic transformation Moses is transformed into Joshua, the one who had to lead his people to the Promised Land. Joshua also, had to break down the walls of Jericho. Egypt, Jericho and Babylon merge in this symbolic field to mean a state of oppression, and without any quantum leap Moses was transformed into Joshua. Manley, fondly called Joshua by his people, was understood to be carrying out the task of Moses with his rod.
(Appendix 1, p. 245)

8) I have a notion of charisma that cannot be seen in isolation from the person, his background, his socio-economic perspective, etc.
(Appendix 1, p. 368)

9) Very often, when you talk of a charismatic leader you talk of someone who is very eloquent but someone who is also somewhat authoritarian.
(Appendix 1.)

10) He is a very charismatic chap and his charisma comes from the fact again of what Jamaicans think.
(Appendix 1, p. 334)

What is evident in the above statements is that there is a sort of basic consensus on charisma as a reality--however vaguely the concept may be defined by each person. In their totality, these statements represent a theory of charisma developed through thought, observation and experience with the responses of a people to political issues over time. They also indicate that (a) charisma is relationship and a way of relating to and with people and (b) that charisma has to do with power and how power is used. Thus, in any given society, an understanding of the charismatic must entail an understanding of the basis of power within the society.

If, then, one does not deliver what one promises to deliver one will lose one's messianic appeal and in Jamaican terms one becomes a kind of token image which does not have the force or the power to put into action what one's words and gestures have dramatically enacted.

The test of whether one can deliver or not is the end point of messianic action. The crucial appeal of charisma lies in the initial acts and behaviours--the ones that establish the base for any kind of future action. In this sense, Michael Manley made the most dramatic impact on his people's psyche in the period before and after the 1972 general election, and it is this initial impact that will cause him to either rise or fall in the future. The population is still remembering the hysteria of the times. The photographs of Michael Manley in mass meetings (Appendix IV), as well as his role depicted in films such as Joshua, which was produced by the PNP in the seventies, captured a mood and a time that I sensed in my observations of the PNP's 45th annual conference.

All these revealed Michael Manley as the ultimate performer whose responses were ignited by the crowd and who in turn related to the crowd in a very dynamic and responsive way--a way that most people have described as charismatic, perhaps for want of a better word. In this regard, the following observation is substantiated:

> I don't think he was uncomfortable with Joshua. Michael is more a big crowd man. He is at best with fifty thousand people. He is not nearly as good with ten.
> (Appendix 1, p. 392)

The perception that Michael Manley is a charismatic leader is more than mythology--it is a fact. His way of relating to a large crowd is magnetic and has to be based on an inner understanding of himself as an individual and on a deep understanding of the workings of the crowd and the response level of people seen as a group and as a crowd. The essence of this relationship is the same as that which was captured and developed by Le Bon (1930) in his discussion of the mass mind. He talks of the psychological crowd which is characterized not as a number of individuals congregated at the same place at the same time, but as a number of people under the influence of certain violent emotions. Thus an entire nation may become a "crowd" under certain influences (p. 27). This phenomenon lends itself to the collective mind and in this state Le Bon asserts that the individual loses his essential uniqueness and becomes part of a new and weakened entity. This weakening is hinged to the fact that the individual loses his identity and becomes part of the crowd identity, and this oftentimes causes individuals "to act in less than rational ways" (p. 33).

Le Bon (1930) saw the causes of this mass mind as rooted in three issues--the loss of the individual will, contagion and suggestibility. A combination of all of these cause a transformation of ideas and render a crowd intellectually inferior to the individual. This is not to say that the crowd cannot be a positive force. The outcome of any group response is ultimately dependent on the dominant sentiments within the group and the social and political conditions of the day. Therefore, in one context a crowd can be fired with enthusiasm and glory and see hope for redemption in the future. In another context the same crowd could become a lynching mob.

Le Bon's crowd is always impressed by excessive sentiments of one type or another and generally exacts exaggerations from its heroes and leaders: "On the stage a crowd depends on the hero of the piece, a degree of courage, morality and virtue that is ever to be found in real life" (Le Bon, 1930, p. 58). Such a crowd thinks in images, and is impressed by and responds to images, and every great statesman of every age and every country can be portrayed as having a great regard for the popular imagination which eventually becomes the basis of his power. Making a connection between the semi-religious energies and charismatic political leadership, Le Bon (1930) argued that:

> a person is not religious solely when he worships a divinity, but when he puts all the resources of his mind, the complete submission of his will, and the whole-souled ardour of fanticism at the service of a cause or an individual thus allowing his thoughts and actions to be guided. The majority of great men who have swayed men's minds do so in the political arena rather than from the altar but they still pull on the same sentiments that forced men to go forth and spread the Gospel. They are still dealing with a crowd that "demands a God before everything else" (p. 85).

In these terms all the interviews projected charisma as a quality possessed and acted out by Michael Manley--hence he can be described as a personality highly responsive to a crowd, a personality which absorbs the psychic messages of the crowd and a personality with an extraordinary sensitivity to the signals given by a crowd and the signals that need to be given to a crowd. All the learned though undescribable possibilities of what is loosely called body language and non-verbal communication within the context of his society have been mastered by Michael Manley and are eloquently demonstrated in his public performances.

In Jamaican society charisma is therefore a political ace card. Such an analysis purports the need for performance in cultures that are largely non-literate. Politics on one level is catharsis and within Caribbean cultures in general there is a consistent pattern of performance-oriented needs. In the specific Jamaican context there have historically been various forms of culturally inspired performance-type institutions. In the various carnivals, festivals and in some of the religious rituals and ceremonies there is an affirmation of the national need for performance.

If performance and the need for performance is an offshoot of a folk tradition, then I can extrapolate and wonder whether Jamaicans do indeed view politics at some very inchoate level as a kind of performance, and whether it is that need especially for oral and visual performance that a leader such as Michael Manley plugs into--however consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly. The possibility that charisma lies within the context of performance has to do wtith the obvious pleasure that Jamaicans take with words. At all levels they can be observed as a very vocal people and Michael Manley epitomizes the ultimate orator and it is his oratory that every interviewee reveres. In fact I got the distinct feeling that he is feared by some (especially by his opponents) because he is seen as having that unpredictable power that only words can give. All who speak of his charisma, speak also of his immense capacity with words.

> He had and still has an unparalleled verbal gift and verbal facility.
> (Appendix 1, p. 387)
>
> So, invariably, you will get a situation where the people say, "I don't care who says what, whatever the leader says is what I am going with".
> (Appendix 1, p. 370)
>
> He has a magical quality (more than charisma), a way of mobilizing and motivating people (old people, young people, farmers and the unemployed).
> (Appendix 1, p. 306)
>
> He has a natural appeal, is a tremendous orator and a very principled person.
> (Appendix 1, p. 253)
>
> His charisma is linked to four qualities. One is a gift of oratory.
> (Appendix 1, p. 345)

Even those who do not refer directly to Michael Manley's oratorical skills, admit in other ways to his ability to mobilize and generate an energy that creates mass responses to his words.

If Jamaicans have a kind of psychic fascination with words and Michael Manley is the magician with words it is not surprising that his use of words is the strength of his charismatic appeal. To take this one step further, the recent manifestations of 'dub poetry' and dub poets in Jamaica present us with a classic proof of the romance of the Jamaicans with words and sounds. The appeal of popular artists such as Yellowman, Sister Nancy, Big Youth, Mutabaruka and Oku Onuora lies in the fact that they string together words which do not necessarily have logic but words which conjure up images that appeal to different levels of their audiences.

The vitality of these performances and the power of the words was captured by Mervyn Morris (1982) in his article People Speech: Some Dub Poets. In this article he posits that:

> Dub poets often speak in a language, and articulate concerns, shared with reggae masters; they seek to communicate with that enormous audience touched by the reggae performers. Predominantly they write for the ear, and they crave opportunities to perform before audiences and to market their work on record (p. 3).

In an overview of the use of language by members of the Caribbean artistic community Nettleford (1978) highlighted the following:

> ...the cult of the word as sound, its sound value, as for example, when words are concocted to make onomatopoeic sense or nonsense; the concretizing or the grounding, that is the fleshing out of ideas; imaginative visualizations; Afro-puns and the calypsonic miming of words--the philosophic symbolism in which poems and folksongs bring the metaphysical and the mundane into a single unity of life....(p. 17).

Language becomes both the medium and the symbol system through which complex attitudes and political stances are stated, restated, refined and reflected. What is captured within the theory of oral performance and its magical value for Jamaicans is the possibility that the Jamaican need for this kind of performance was in itself satisfied by Michael Manley as ultimate orator--thus ultimate messianic politician. When this dimension of a leader is extended to the recognition by many of the interviewees that charisma is not only a way of relating but a way of responding in concrete terms, then the fact becomes apparent that such a concept is largely dependent not only on personal dynamics but on the vicissitudes of the socio-economic and political realities of a society. In these terms charisma was both a positive and a negative force in Michael Manley's political career.

Conclusions and Implications

In this thesis I am arguing polemically and in an exploratory way on an issue which is still in process given the present condition of Jamaica's political history. This research was done at a very crucial and exciting moment because the next Jamaican general elections will undoubtedly bring Jamaicans full circle on their ideological exploration. They have vacilliated between the two political parties (JLP and PNP) over the years. This vacilliation has gone on in spite of the shifting political images of the two parties and their respective leaders.

It is interesting to note that under Bustamante the JLP was preceived as the party of the uneducated masses while the PNP under Norman Manley was the party that caught the attention of the middle class and educated classes. Over the past fifteen years these images have been completely reversed. The JLP under the present leadership is supported by the merchandising class, and a significant sector of the educated elite while it retains its appeal to unpredictable segments of the masses. The PNP, on the other hand, under Michael Manley's leadership has come to be identified as the party that has the interest of the poor and dispossessed at heart. Also under Michael Manley, the PNP lost a significant degree of its appeal to the middle and educated classes.

The present situation dictates that any one who attempts any kind of revolutionary transformation must take into account the tradition of survival and struggle that has been a feature of the masses. It is now evident that neither the early nationalism of Norman Manley nor the socialism of Michael Manley nor Edward Seaga's Free Enterprise has been able to take the spirit of the masses into consideration. What is clear is that resistance to authority is embedded in the psychic inheritance of the slavery past. This resistance contemporarily works against the native leaders as it did against the planters and the colonial governors.

The structural realities of the economy, the political process and the culture in general still serve to marginalize the masses, and this sector will naturally resist even when decisions are taken in their name and in their interest.

Objectively and subjectively my inquiry into the Jamaican socio-political system reveals that the economic, social, legal and cultural power are not yet fully within the grasp of the mass of the population. Also it is as obvious in the eighties as it was in the past decades that the colour/class correlation persists because poverty resides in stark and painful terms among the majority who are black. Privilege and easy access to prosperity still remain as the perogative of the whites, near-whites and non-blacks. This does not negate the fact that there are few obviously black people amongst the privileged. However, the marginalization of the black majority continues to be a function of race dynamics in a society that likes to boast about its pluralism and its racial tolerance.

Michael Manley is now very aware of the heightened contradictions of his society. He is also very aware of the different levels of criticism of his policies, his personal style and his ideology. With this awareness, he continues to stand by what he believes in. He still defends his attempts at structural and attitudional changes in his society. This he does with the same commitment and passion that gave life to his charismatic appeal.

Because Michael Manley is a man of strong passions and a deep sense of justice and fair play, he cannot help but comprehend at a very visceral level the subtly of the Jamaican race/class antagonisms of the 80's. Undoubtedly, he knows that without meaningful social structural and economic changes, the society is potentially poised for violent upheaval.

Jamaica is therefore one situation that needs the attention of a variety of people, agencies and institutions (nationally and inter nationally). I sensed this mood as I interacted with the various persons who contributed directly and indirectly to this study. In sensing this mood, I also came to believe that Michael Manley will have a role in moving Jamaica out of its present socio-psychological slump. This he will do in spite of the fact that he is a man obviously perplexed by the problems of political life, by the demands of his internal needs and by the vicissitudes of his personal and private life.

In the final analysis Michael Manley was not "charismatic" in Weberian terms. His belief in democracy, his striving for consensous and his planned programs negate the purely charismatic. The quality that distinguishes and move adequately define his leadership style as "messianic". This study has highlighted the distinguishing qualities of messianism within the Jamaican political culture.

The concept of the messianic politician is reduced to the concept of charisma by all the interviewees in this study. This is a case of a term which has moved beyond its original formulation, and which has come to be generalized almost to the state of vulgarization. These definitional issues must be taken into consideration in studies of leadership and personality.

In this study the concept of charisma becomes the scaffolding on which to build a theory of messianism in politics. This approach is particulary useful when in a new context an attempt is made at using models of analysis which were developed to fit particular societies and particular times in history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aberle, David F. "A Note on Relative Deprivation Theory", in Thrupp, S., Millenial Dreams in Action. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Abrahams, Peter. This Island Now. Faber and Faber, 1966.

Alves, A. Ruben. A Theology of Human Hope. Corpus Books, 1969.

Adorno, Theodor W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper Bros., 1950.

Allan, Graham. "A Theory of Millenialism: The Irvingite Movement as an Illustration", British Journal of Sociology, 25:3. September, 1974. (pp. 296-311)

Anderson, Charles W., Fred R. von der Mehden and Crawford Young. Issues of Political Development. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Arawak, Christopher. Jamaica's Michael Manley, Messiah...Muddler or Marionette? Sir Henry Morgan Press, 1980.

Aronoff, Joel. Psychological Needs and Cultural Systems. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1967.

Barnett, H.G. Indian Shakers: A Messianic Cult of the Pacific Northwest. Feffer and Simons, Inc., 1972.

Barrett, Leonard E. The Rastafarians. Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., 1977.

Bartlett, Irving H. and Richard L. Schoenwald. "The Psychodynamics of Slavery", Journal of Interdisciplinary History, IV:4. Spring, 1974. (pp. 627-633)

Beckford, G. Persistent Poverty. Oxford University Press, 1972.

Beckford, George and Michael Witter. Small Garden... Bitter Weed. Jamaica: Maroom Publishing House, 1980.

Bee, Robert L. Patterns and Processes: An Introduction to Anthropological Strategies for the Study of Sociocultural Change. Colier MacMillan Publishers, 1974.

Beit-Hallahmi. "National Character and National Behavior in the Middle East Conflict: The Case of the'Arab Personality'", International Journal of Group Tensions, Vol. 2, #3, 1972. (pp. 19-27)

Bell, Wendell. Jamaican Leaders, University of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles, Ca., 1964.

Berg, Nancy E. and Paul Mussen. "The Origins and Development of Concepts of Justice", Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 31, #3, 1975.

Berger, Peter I. Pryamids of Sacrifice. Political Ethics and Social Change. Penguin Books, 1974.

Berger, Peter I. and Thomas Luckman. The Social Construction of Reality. Anchor Books, 1967.

Berger, Peter I. and Richard J. Heuhaus. Movement and Revolution. Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1970.

Berkhofer, Robert F. Jr. A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis. New York: 1969.

Bernard, Harold Wright. Human Development in Western Culture. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1962.

Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968.

Bonino, Jose Miguez. Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age. London: SPCK, 1975.

Boot, Adrian and Michael Thomas. Jamaica: Babylon on a Thin Wire. Thames and Hudson, 1976.

Booth, David. Cuba, Color and the Revolution in Science and Society, Volume XL, Number 2. Summer 1976.

Bopegamage, A. and I. Narayanswami. "Studies in Psycho-Historical Aspects of Leadership", The Indian Journal of Social Work, Vol. XXXIV, #3. October, 1973. (pp. 216-222)

Bottomore, Tom. Marxist Sociology. British Sociological Association, 1975.

Branthal, Julius. In Search of the Millenium. London: Victor Follance, 1945.

Brown, J.F. Psychology and the Social Order. McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1936.

Browning, Rufus P. and Herbert Jacob. "Power Motivation and the Political Personality", Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 28, 1964. (pp. 75-90)

Browning, Rufus P. "The Interaction of Personality and Political System in Decisions to Run for Office: Some Data and a Simulation Technique", Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIV, #3, 1968.

Burridge, Kenelm. Mambu: A Melanesian Millenium. Metheun & Co. Ltd., 1960.

________________ New Heaven, New Earth (A Study of Millenarian Activities). New York: Schocken Books, 1969.

Candee, Dan. "The Moral Psychology of Watergate:, Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 31 (2), 1975. (pp. 183-192)

Cantril, Hadley. The Psychology of Social Movements. New York: Wiley, 1941.

Cashmore, Ernest. Rastaman: The Rastafarian Movement in England. George Allen and Unwin, 1979.

Cante, David. Fanon. Fontana/Collins, 1972.

Clark, W.H. The Psychology of Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1958.

Clarke, Edith. My Mother Who Fathered Me. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1966.

Cleage, Albert B. Black Christian Nationalism. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1972.

Cohn, Norman. The Pursuit of the Millenium. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Cronon, Edmund D. Black Moses: The Story of Marcus Garvey. The University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.

Cuthbert, Marlene. "Some Observations on the Role of the Mass Media in the Recent Socio-Political Development in Jamaica", Caribbean Quarterly, Vol. 22, #4. December, 1976. (pp. 50-58)

Da Cunha, Euclides. Rebellion in the Backlands. The University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Dale, Edmund H. Spotlight on the Caribbean, A Microcosm of the Third World. Department of Geography, University of Regina, 1977.

Davis, Lenwood G. and Janet L. Sims. Marcus Garvey. Greenwood Press, 1980.

Deosaran, Ramesh. Bishop's Charisma and the Grenada Tragedy. The Daily Gleaner, Tuesday, November 8, 1983. (p. 8)

Devereaux, George. Charismatic Leadership and Crisis: Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences. New York: International University Press, 1955.

De Renzo, Gordon J. (ed). Personality and Politics. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1974.

Dolgoff, Sam. The Cuban Revolution: A Critical Perspective. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1976.

D'Oyley, Vincent & Murray R. (ed). Development and Disillusion in Third World Education. Symposium Series 10, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979.

Draper, Theodore. Castroism: Theory and Practice. Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.

Dubois, Jules. Fidel Castro. Bobb-Merrill Co., Inc., 1959.

Eaton, George E. Alexander Bustamate and Modern Jamaica. Kingston Publishers Ltd., 1975.

Edelman, Murray. The Symbolic Uses of Politics. University of Illinois Press, 1977.

Edinger, Lewis G. Kurt Schumacher - A Study in Personality and Political Behavior. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1963.

______________ Young Man Luther. New York: Norton, 1958.

Fagen, R.R. The Transformation of Political Culture in Cuba. Stanford University Press, 1969.

Fannon, Frantz. A Dying Colonialism. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1965.

Fathi, Asghar. "The Role of the 'Rebels' in the Constitutional Movement in Iran", International Journal of Middle East Studies, 10 (1979). (pp. 55-66)

Freedman, Anne E., and P.E. Freedman. The Psychology of Political Control. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. The Seabury Press, 1968.

Freud, S. Civilization and Its Discontents. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Ltd., 1962 Edition.

Fromm, Erich. The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness. Fawcett Publications Inc., 1973.

_______________ The Dogma of Christ and Other Essays on Religion. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

_______________ Escape From Freedom. Avon Books, 1966 Printing.

Furst, Peter T. Flesh of the Gods. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Gager, John G. Kingdom and Community (The Social World of Early Christianity). Prentice-Hall Inc., 1975.

Gannon, John C. "The Racial Ideology in Jamaican Politics: The People's Political Party in the Parliamentary Elections of 1962", Caribbean Studies. Vol. 16, Nos. 3 and 4.

George, Alexander L. "Power as a Compensatory Value for Political Leaders", Journal of Social Issues. Vol. XXIV, #3, 1968.

George, A. and J.L. Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House - A Personality Study. New York: John Day, 1956.

Gerth, Harris and C. Wright Mills. Character and Social Structure. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953.

Geyer, Alan F. Piety and Politics. John Knox Press, 1963.

Glad, Betty. "Contributions of Psychobiography", in Knutson, Jeanne N., Handbook of Political Psychology. Jossey Bass Publishers, 1973.

Gonzalez, Edward. Cuba Under Castro: The Limits of Charisma. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974.

Goulet, D. A New Moral Order. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1974.

Gratus, Jack. The False Messiahs. London: Victor Gollancz, 1975.

Greenblatt, Milton. "Towards a Definition of Psychopolitics", Psychiatric Annals, (N.Y.), Vol. 5, #10. October, 1975. (pp. 6-11).

Greenstein, Fred I. "The Impact of Personality on Politics: An Attempt to Clear Away Underbrush", American Political Science Review, #61 1967. (pp. 629-641)

________________ "The Need for Systematic Inquiry Into Personality and Politics: Introduction and Overview", Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIV, #3, July, 1968.

________________ Personality and Politics. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1969.

________________ "Personality and Politics: Problem of Evidence Inference and Conceptualization", The American Behavioral Scientist. November-December, 1967. (pp. 38-53)

Grier, W.H. and P.M. Cobbs. The Jesus Bag. McGray-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Gutierrez, Gustavo. A Theology of Liberation. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1973.

Gyorgy, Andrew and George Blackwood. Ideologies in World Affairs, Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967.

Hagen, Everett. On the Theory of Social Change. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1962.

Hall, Calvin S. and G. Lindzey. Theories of Personality. New York: Wiley, 1957.

Hall, N.A.T. Some Aspects of the "Deficiency" Question in Jamaica in the Eighteenth Century. Caribbean Studies. Vol. 15, #1, 1975.

Hartnecker, Marta. Cuba: Dictatorship or Democracy. Connecticut: Lawrence Hill and Co., 1979.

Hearne, John (ed). The Search for Solutions (Selections from the Speeches and Writings of Michael Manley). Maple House Publishing Co., 1976. Hearne, John. Voices under the Window. Faber and Faber, 1973.

Heiss, Jerold. The Social Psychology of Interaction. Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Henriques, Fernando. Family and Colour in Jamaica. MacGibbon & Kee, 1968.

Hermann, Margaret C. (ed. with Thomas W. Milburn). A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders. The Free Press, 1977.

Heuman, Gad J. Between Black and White: Race, Politics and the Free Coloureds in Jamaica 1792-1862. Greenwood Press, 1981.

Hill, Christopher. The World Turned Upside Down. Penguin Books Ltd., 1975.

Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Huberman, Leo and Paul M. Sweezy. Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution. Monthly Review Press, 1960.

Huntington, Samuel P. Political Order in Changing Societies. Yale University Press, 1972.

Hutschnecker, Arnold A. The Drive for Power. New York: M. Evans and Co., Inc., 1974.

Isaak, Robert A. Individuals and World Politics. Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1975.

Jamaica: Caribbean Challenge. A People's Primer by the EPICA Task Force, 1979.

James, C.L.R. The Black Jacobins. Random House, New York, 1963.

James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: Collier Books, 1961.

Janowitz, M. and D. Marvick. "Authoritarianism and Political Behavior", Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 17. (pp. 185-201), Summer 1953.

Johnson, Janis & Rankin, Robert A. Interviewing Michael Manley. Caribbean Review, Vol. XI, No. 3, Summer 1982.

Josephson, Eric and Mary. Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society. Dell Publishing Co., 1977.

Kearns, Doris. Lyndon Johnson and The American Dream. Signet Books, 1977.

Kerr, Madeline. Personality and Conflict in Jamaica. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1952.

Kets De Vries and Manfred, F.R. "Crisis Leadership and the Paranoid Potential", Menninger Clinic Bulletin, Vol. 41, #4. (pp. 349-365), July, 1977.

Kluckholn, C. and H. Murray (eds.). Personality in Nature, Society and Culture. New York: Knopf, 1955.

Knutson, Jeanne N. (ed). Handbook of Political Psychology. Jossey Bass Publishers, 1973.

Knutson, Jeanne N. Personality Correlates of Political Behavior: A Longitudinal Analysis. University Microfilms (73-32068), 1973.

Kollontai, Alexandra. Autobiography of a Sexually-Emancipated Woman. Orbach and Chambers Ltd., London, 1972.

Kuper, Adam. Changing Jamaica. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

La Barre, Weston. The Peyote Cult. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.

Lacouture, Jean. The Demigods: Charismatic Leadership in the Third World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Lanternari, Vittorio. The Religions of the Oppressed: A Study of Modern Messianic Cults. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Lasswell, Harold D. "A Note on 'Types' of Political Personality: Nuclear, Co-Relational, Developmental", Journal of Social Issues. Vol. XXIV, No. 3 (pp. 81-91), 1968.

________________ "The Political Personality", in Di Renzo, G.J., Personality and Politics. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1974.

________________ Power and Personality. New York: Viking Press, 1962.

________________ Psychopathology and Politics. New York: Viking Press, 1962.

Lawrence, Peter. Road Belong Cargo: A Study of the Cargo Movement in the Southern Madang District, New Guinea. Manchester University Press, 1964.

Leacock, S. and R. Spirits of the Deep (A Study of an Afro-Brazilian Cult). Anchor Books, 1975.

Le Bon, Gustave. The Crowd - A Study of the Popular Mind. Ernest Benn Ltd., 1930.

Lefley, Harriet P. "Modal Personality in the Bahamas", Journal of CrossCultural Psychology. Vol. 3, No. 2 (pp. 135-147). June, 1972.

Leiden, Carl and Karl M. Schmitt. The Politics of Violence: Revolution in the Modern World. Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968.

Lewis, Gordon K. Main Currents in Caribbean Thought. The Johns Hopkins University Press. London, 1983.

Lewis, I.M. Ecstatic Religion. Penguin Books, 1971.

Lewy, Gunter. Religion and Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Lindsay, Louis. The Myth of Independence: Middle Class Politics and Nonmobilization in Jamaica. Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, 1975.

Lukacs, Georg. History and Class Consciousness. The Merlin Press Ltd., 1971.

Maddi, Salvatore R. Personality Theories. The Dorsey Press, 1976.

Mais, Roger. Brother Man. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1979.

Mandel, Ernest. An Introduction to Marxist Economic Theory. Pathfinder Press Inc., 1970.

Manley, Michael. The Politics of Change: A Jamaica Testament. Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1974.

________________ A Voice at the Workplace. Andre Deutsch, Ltd., 1975.

________________ Jamaica: Struggle in the Periphery, Third World Media, 1982.

Mariategui, J.C. Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Realty. University of Texas Press, 1971.

Massing, Michael. Grenada Before and After. The Atlantic. Vol. 253, No. 2. February, 1984.

Mazuri, Ali A. The African Condition: A Political Diagnosis. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1980.

McKnight, Cathy and John Tobler. Bob Marley: The Roots of Reggae. W.H. Allen & Co. Ltd., 1977.

Memmi, Albert. The Colonizer and the Colonized. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.

Merelman, Richard M. "The Development of Political Ideology: A Framework for the Analysis of Political Socialization", in Jack Dennis' Socialization to Politics. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1973.

Merriam, Charles E. "The Significance of Psychology for the Study of Politics", The American Political Science Review. Vol. XVIII, No. 3. August, 1924.

Mills, C. Wright. The Marxists. Dell Publishing Co. Inc., 1962.

Miranda, Jose. Marx and the Bible. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1974.

Moellering, Ralph L. "The Rise of Communism - The Reaction of the Church", Communism, Valparaiso University, 1971.

Morris, Mervyn. People Speech: Some "Dub Poets". University of the West Indies, 1982.

Mosca, Gaetano. The Ruling Class. McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939.

Munro, Trevor. The Marxist "Left" in Jamaica 1940-1950 Working Paper #15. Institute of Social and Economic Research (University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica).

Naipaul, V.S. An Island Betrayed. Harper's, Vol. 268, No. 1606, March, 1984.

Nettleford, Rex M. Caribbean Cultural Identity: The Case of Jamaica. Institute of Jamaica, 1978.

Nettleford, Rex (ed.). Manley and the New Jamaica (Selected Speeches and Writings, 1938-1968). Longman Caribbean, 1971.

Nettleford, Rex M. Mirror, Mirror: Identity, Race and Protest in Jamaica. William Collins and Sangster (Jamaica) Ltd., 1970.

Nichols, David. "Politics and Religion in Haiti", Canadian Journal of Political Science. Vol. 3, 1970.

Norris, Katrin. Jamaica: The Search for an Identity. Oxford University Press, 1962.

Northrop, F.S.C. The Meeting of East and West. The Macmillan Company, 1947.

Nkrumah, Kwame. Class Struggle in Africa. Panaf Books Ltd., 1970.

Owens, Joseph. Dread: The Rastafarians of Jamaica. Sangster's Book Stores Ltd., 1976.

Parsons, Talcott. Social Structure and Personality. London: Collier-MacMillan Ltd., 1965.

Patterson, Orlando. The Sociology of Slavery. Granada Publishing Ltd., 1973.

Paz, O. The Labyrinth of Solitude. Grove Press Inc., 1961.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

Price, Richard. Maroon Societies. The John Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Romos, S. Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico. University of Texas Press, 1962.

Randall, Margaret. Cuban Women Now. The Women's Press, 1974.

Reid, Stanley. An Introductory Approach to the Concentration of Power in the Jamaican Corporate Economy and notes on its origins in Stone, C. & Brown, A. Essays on Power and Change in Jamaica. Jamaican Publishing House, 1977.

Renshon, Stanley Allen. Psychological Needs and Political Behavior: A Theory of Personality and Political Efficacy. New York: Free Press, 1974.

Rhone, Trevor. Old Story Time. Longman, 1981.

Rodney, Walter. How Europe Underdeveloped Africa. Tanzania Publishing House, 1972.

________________ The Groundings with my Brothers. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, 1969.

Rude, George. Ideology an Popular Protest. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Russell, Bertrand. Power. Unwin Books, London, 1938.

Rustow, Dankwart A. Philosophers and Kings--Studies in Leadership. New York: George Brazilla, 1970.

Schultz, R.C. "A Theology for the Church as it Faces the World-Wide Race Problem" (essay), Valparaiso University, 1961.

Sennett, R. and Cobb, Jonathan. The Hidden Injuries of Class. Vintage Books, 1973.

Sherlock, Philip. Norman Manley. MacMillan London Ltd., 1980.

Singer, David J. "Man and World Politics: The Psych-Cultural Interface", Journal of Social Issues. Vol. XXIV, No. 3, 1968.

Sio, Arnold A. Race, Colour and Miscegenation: The Free Coloured of Jamaica and Barbados. Caribbean Studies. Vol. 16, #1, 1976.

Smelser, Neil J. "Personality and the Explanation of Political Phenomena at the Social-System Level: A Methodological Statement", Journal of Social Issues. Vol. XXIV, No. 3, 1968.

Smelser, Neil J. Theory of Collective Behaviour. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Smelser, N.J. and W.T. Smelser. Personality and Social Systems. New York: Wiley, 1963.

Smith, M. Brewster. "A Map for the Analysis of Personality in Politics", Journal of Social Issues. Vol. XXIV, No. 3, 1968.

Smith, M.G., Roy Augier, and Rex Nettleford. The Rastafari Movement in Kingston, Jamaica. Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1960.

Stark, Stanley. "Towards a Psychology of Charisma: The Pathology Viewpoint of James C. Davies", Psychological Reports. No. XXIV (pp. 88-90), 1969.

Stokes, Gale. "Cognition and the Function of Nationalism", Journal of Interdisciplinary History. IV:4 (Spring, 1974) (pp. 525-542).

Stone, Carl. Ideology, Public Opinion and the Media in Jamaica.

________________ Jamaica's 1980 Elections: What Manley Did Do; What Seaga Need Do. Caribbean Review, Vol. 2, No. 2, Spring 1981.

________________ The Jamaican Reaction: Grenada and the Political Stalemate, Caribbean Review, Vol XII, No. 4, Fall 1983.

________________ Class, Race and Political Behaviour in Urban Jamaica, Institute of Social and Economic Research, U.W.J., 1973.

Stone, William F. The Psychology of Politics. The Free Press, 1974.

Tawney, R.H. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. The New American Library, 1922.

Terhune, Kenneth W. "From National Character to National Behaviour: A Reformation", Conflict Resolution. Vol. XIV, No. 2.

Theodorson, G.A. A Modern Dictionary of Sociology. Barnes and Noble Books, 1979.

Thomas, Clive Y. Dependence and Transformation: The Economics of the Transition to Socialism. Monthly Review Press (2nd Printing), 1976.

Thrupp, Sylvia T. (ed). Millenian Dreams in Action. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Unger, Roberto M. Knowledge and Politics. New York: Free Press, 1975.

Wallace, Anthony F.C. The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca. Vantage Books Edition, 1972.

Wallis, Wilson D. Messiahs--Their Role in Civilization. Washington, D.C.: The American Council of Public Affairs, 1943.

Williams, Eric. Inward Hunger: The Education of a Prime Minister. Andre Deutsch, 1969.

________________ Capitalism and Slavery. Andre Deutsch, 1964.

________________ From Columbus to Castro: The History of the Caribbean 1492-1969. Andre Deutsch, 1970.

Wilson, Colin. Religion and the Rebel. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1957.

Wolfenstein, E.V. The Revolutionary Personality: Lenin, Trotsky, and Ghandi. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Worsley, Peter. The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of "Cargo" Cults in Melanesia. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Zaleznik, Abraham. "Psychopathology and Politics Reconsidered", Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic. Vol. 39, No. 2, 1975.

Zaleznik, Abraham and Manfred F.R. Dets de Vries. Power and the Corporate Mind. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1975.

Between Honesty and Hope. Maryknoll Documentation Series, Maryknoll Publications, 1970.

"Calls for Support of Liberation Movement", The Christian News. May 27, 1974.

APPENDIX 1

A. SUPPORTERS OF THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY

PARTY SUPPORTER AND FORMER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: Many of the PNP executives and leaders did not use the word Socialism after the 1967 elections, and, as far as socialist policies were concerned, they claimed that the detailed plans that we had drafted were not used in that election. There was a kind of agreement that leading up to the 1972 elections we would be as vague as possible in terms of spelling out what we intended to do, because it was felt that in 1967 our plans had alienated large sectors of the people and had mobilized even more against the party, so the main thing that the party concentrated on was the criticism of the Jamaica Labour Party and its policies and programs. Generally, we created this mood of hope for better--that better must come and that better would come under the PNP. What was left unsaid was how this would come about.

As far as Democratic Socialism was concerned, it was after winning power in 1972 that it became clear that one had to certainly be more specific about what one intends to do. The concept needed to be put in a more logical kind of framework, and Michael Manley might have decided even before the elections how he was going to put this in operational terms, because it was he who led the party back on to the Socialist path. The reason why Democratic Socialism was used was a matter of strategy or tactics, because Manley has always tried to maintain the balance amongst the various tendencies in the party. His approach has been a non-confrontationist one in the sense that he has chosen not to have a confrontation between competing outlooks within the party. As far as possible, he wanted to achieve consensus knowing that you might have an isolated defection here or there, but never dealing in a situation where you have open confrontation to the extent that you might get a split in the party. The experience of 1952 was a lesson and

Michael Manley has tried not to have a repeat of this situation. Democratic Socialism was therefore adapted partly out of a concern for, or apprehension of, the more right wing elements within the party. Some of these persons had offered other labels such as Christian Socialism. Democratic as a description of the PNP's brand of Socialism was adopted to show that we were not socialists of the Marxist-Leninist type, which was seen as too alienating to the middle class.

SIMMS: Can you describe the relationship between Michael Manley and the PNP structure?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: One needs to start off by recognizing that the structure of the party has a historic base in that the PNP was set up as a political party--the first serious political party in Jamaica. It was conceptualized as a mass political party, and a democratic organization for the purpose of getting the Jamaican people involved in politics. Prior to its establishment, only a small minority of the people were involved in politics in any sense. As a result of more involvement, the party could then press forward to win the right of the people to vote and then to win self-government for Jamaica. This was the process that was started in 1938.

The party was, from these beginnings, a democratic structure and this structure still exists. Within this there are rules and regulations dealing with how one enters the party and how one operates within the party if one is to maintain membership. The structure is a very rational --legal democratic one. The second thing that one has to bear in mind is that within a few years of its establishment, the party had to face a reality which might not have existed at its formation, but which it helped to bring about, and having brought this about, it changed the situation--this is the reality of electoral politics. Inherent within the Westminster Model, which we adopted (or which was given to us) is the phenomenon that people vote for persons or individuals as personalities. Constitutionally, Jamaicans do not vote for the PNP or the JLP, they do not vote for a party, they vote for a person. What this means is that it is the more flamboyant and dominating personalities who were more often successful at the polls.

Central to the understanding of this phenomenon within the Jamaican experience is the personality of Alexander Bustamante, because, although the PNP was established as a political party before the JLP, the JLP won those first elections in 1944, not because it had a good organizational structure (it had very little or no structure, all it had was a name), but because the candidates were seen as "Bustamante's candidates". Bustamante is reputed to have been convinced in those days that if he put up a dog as a candidate, the people would have voted for him. He could have held this belief because he knew full well that the people were voting for him--not for Democracy, not for Liberalism, and not for Conservatism or even for Capitalism, but for Bustamante. Thus, when the voters voted for C.C. Campbell in Westmoreland or for Pixley in Central Kingston, or for any other JLP candidate, they were in fact voting for Bustamante. They were voting for Bustamante because he meant something to them. He needed no policies or written manifesto because his meaning to the masses was that of a man who had identified with the struggle of the working class masses of Jamaica. He had identified himself as their leader who was willing to do anything for them, even to sacrifice his life. Therefore, from this one can understand the importance of the personality.

As far as the apparent contradiction between the PNP's democratic organizational structure and the personal dominance of Michael Manley, one has to look in two historical directions--inside the PNP and outside the PNP. Inside the PNP we see that in the early days, there were a number of strong personalities typified by Norman Manley, the outstanding individual in the island up to 1938 (Rhodes scholar, brilliant barrister, etc. etc.), a man who was looked up to by all classes of people, as the outsanding Jamaican at that particular time. Bustamante eventually eclipsed Norman Manley because of his role in the labour struggles at the time. Manley's personality also did not have the kind of dominance within the organization because he believed in the democratic and the organized approach.

There were also some other strong personalities who were leaders within the national movement in their own rights, and many of them were, in fact, involved before Norman Manley who was brought in because of his abilities and his symbolism. There were people like Ken Hill, one of the young journalists and brilliant speakers of the time, Noel Nethersole, another brilliant man, and people like Richard Hart, Florizel Glasspole and Wills Issacs and others--men who were leaders of significant constituencies and with a variety of strengths and varying spheres of influence.

The democratic organization of the PNP facilitated all of these people within its structure which had the stamp of Norman Manley's distinction and ideals. However, in 1952, many of these leaders were expelled from the PNP (Ken Hill, Richard Hart, Frank Hill and Al Henry, in fact, the leading personalities in terms of mass appeal). Thereafter, Norman Manley seems to take on a more powerful role within the party in that, although others such as Glasspole and Issacs remained, their personalities never really dominated. Manley became much more the leader after 1952. Also, the party itself became much less a party that dealt with political ideas and more a party that sets the ideas of the leader.

The second aspect is what was happening outside of the PNP--this is the phenomenon of Bustamante. Although it was the PNP that led the struggle for political organization, involvement and responsible government, it was Bustamante who benefitted politically and held power for seventeen years after the formation of the PNP. Because of this, the party responded more and more to Bustamante by making its leadership more and more like him--thus projecting into its leadership more and more the attributes of "the leader". Norman Manley therefore became not just president (the constitutional designation) of the PNP, but he became the leader--the comrade leader. This is important to understand because today, Michael Manley is also not just president of the party, he is comrade leader.

Leader then was the answer to the Chief (Bustamante). By creating the leader, more and more the two parties (PNP and JLP) took on features of each other. The JLP (Bustamante party) eventually became somewhat organized even though it never really moved from the context of the chief's personality. The PNP, on the other hand, started out as a highly organized party in search of a leader, but became more and more transformed into a vehicle for the leader and eventually projected more and more the leader. As early as 1955, the PNP published a booklet called, The Man of Destiny. So that even before they became the government, there was a conscious effort to build up Norman Manley as the leader. On the other hand, the JLP had no need to write a booklet--everyone knew who Bustamante was. He was the man who led the march for the workers, bared his chest to the police and security forces, and dared them to shoot him. Norman Manley was a different person, so his party had to let the people understand him in their terms--a man of destiny, a bright barrister.

When Norman Manley became Prime Minister after the 1962 elections, the PNP adopted the slogan--Vote for the Man with the Plan. This is significant because this is a shift from an emphasis on the party. It is no longer the party for which the people vote, it is for the man with the plan. The Man of Destiny is the Man with the Plan and I am told that this is the first election in which any political party in Jamaica had hired special public relations consultants and used huge billboards with slogans, such as "Follow the Man with the Plan" and "Vote for the Man with the Plan". The "Man with the Plan" had now taken over.

At the same time, the JLP was becoming more organized. Bustamante, it seems, up to the time of the election, was always the figurehead of the party. Ironically, in 1962, in response to the "Man with the Plan", he encouraged people to vote for "The Party with the Program". This then is a brief outline of the democratically organized party on the one hand and the dominant leader figure on the other.

Michael Manley is even more of a dominant personality than was his father, Norman Manley. In fact, he is often compared with Bustamante in terms of his symbolism, impact, mass appeal and support.

This then is one part of the answer to the role of leader. Another part of the answer which has to do with the same issue of electoral politics is that more and more elections needed not only candidates but money, and it appears that in the 1944 elections, the PNP tried to adhere to its principles very strictly in that it only put up candidates in constituencies where those candidates met the constitutional criteria. Even where people declared themselves to be supporters of the PNP, they were not allowed to run as candidates if they did not qualify within the framework of the party. However, more and more, with the shifting to the idea that it was important for the party to win power, the need arose to have candidates in every constituency. This meant the constitution was not necessarily adhered to in the long run. Opportunism dictated a more expedient process, and more and more the need for money to run elections became an issue. The party structure was unable to generate this money. This meant that those candidates who had personal assets and could find the money to finance campaigns were the ones who were chosen. It also meant that, as more and more members became parliamentarians, in keeping with the Jamaican constitution, those persons began to dominate the party structure, because it was the Members of Parliament who dispensed patronage. The outcome of this was that those who could demonstrate that they could win elections did not necessarily have to adhere to the party's organizational discipline. This has been the reality.

Increasingly, the dichotomy between the party's constitution and the personalities developed. I would, therefore, conclude that one central reason for this state of affairs has to do with the fact that when the party was being instituted with all its aims, objectives and democratic paraphernalia, sufficient stress was not put on developing the party as a self-reliant and self-financing organization. To a certain extent, this had to do with the fact that the early leaders were middle class or bourgeois folks who had a sort of paternalistic approach to poor people. Norman Manley is reputed to have largely financed the party out of his own resources, however limited these might have been. Emphasis needed to have been placed on funds being generated by the masses themselves through their work and productivity. In this respect, Marcus Garvey was much more successful than any of the other political leaders. These then were the central factors responsible for the dichotomy between party structure and leader.

SIMMS: How do you regard the phenomenon of "Joshua" in this dichotomy?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: I was always aware of what this phenomenon was doing, or trying to do. Even though I cannot say whether or not Michael Manley was always conscious of the image that was being developed (all the dimensions of this and the impact that would have been made on the poor), I certainly know that once he embarked on this path it was very consciously utilized. I was very much aware of what it was doing and I fully supported and identified with the symbolism of "Joshua". I supported it because I regarded it as something which was authentic within the Jamaican tradition of political struggle, and the roots and relationship between our politics and our religous/African background and the symbolism of the relationship of religion to everyday life. Therefore it was very important symbolically to express and articulate the aspirations of the people in order to lead and challenge their aspiration for better into more precise programmatic and policy objectives.

I also believed that in this process, the image would eventually negate itself in the sense that what I thought was being done (and in fact was being done) was that after the 1972 victory more and more there would be an attempt to make the party more democratic and more willing and able to discuss issues. Also the party was being allowed to be more ideologically oriented, and was working more and more at bringing in the people into positions of responsibility within the party. Somewhere along the line there was a contradiction, in that the more you democratized the political process within the party, the more people become critical of leadership. This is a normal response, because in democratization people are being told that they have the right to be critical. When this process is started it means that all myths become exposed. The gods' feet of clay become apparent. The leader has to be unravelled of some of his mystique. In the final analysis one of the most important things to a politician is his ego and it is extremely difficult to lead this kind of process with the knowledge that eventually as a leader one has to tolerate criticism and also be open to self-criticism. This becomes an even greater and traumatic problem in times of problems and crisis within the movement. In the final analysis, one is forced, when threatened, to resort to personal charisma.

I think this is what happened in 1977 at the time of the IMF debate within the PNP. This was a debate about principles, policies and so on, but in order to swing the argument in one direction the charisma of Joshua was utilized. I cannot really say who instigated this--it is difficult to conclude whether this strategy was used by Michael Manley himself or whether others around him led in this direction. It is also difficult to say whether this was a conscious act or whether it was an instinctive reflex on the part of a section of the leaders who interpreted the situation as one in which the leader was being challenged on an individual and personal level.

SIMMS: Can you be more specific on this issue?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: It is difficult to be entirely specific, however, what happened was that in 1977 there was a debate within the party as to whether or not we should accept the IMF's terms and conditions in order to get assistance with our foreign exchange problem or whether we should take some other path. Somewhere along the line and simultaneously with this process, a rumour was spread that there was a plot against Michael Manley within the party. I am therefore saying that it is difficult to say whether some politicians used Michael Manley's name in a self-serving way. In other words, it was fashionable to claim to be on Manley's side even if one did not support his views. If one was seen as being on his side, then whether one's views of world politics or of Jamaica's economic problems were, then one's ambitions would be assisted. This is why I say that some people could have conjured up the image of a threat to the leader in a self-serving manner. At the same time, the persons who were proposing an alternate approach to the economic problems were projected as those opposed to Michael Manley's leadership. This was the outcome. Within the party there was a perception that certain people were undermining the leadership. In the final analysis, after months of controversy, the leader's decision had the support of the party.

SIMMS: Are you saying that the symbol of Joshua took on a life of its own?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: To understand this, one must understand the history of such a phenomenon in the Jamaican political development. This goes back to early stirrings in the religious history of the people, stirrings around such figures as Bedward and Garvey. Bedward came before Garvey, but Garvey's movement was cast within a religious sybmolism and religious messages permeated the political movement. The back to Africa theme, etc., was presented with a lot of biblical overtones. (I am not a student of Garveyism, so I am not pretending to understand the whole thing fully.) Garvey himself composed poems and songs and themes which lent themselves to a church-like kind of organization.

Today, both political parties (JLP and PNP) were infused by the traditions of Garveyism because many of Garvey's followers eventually joined them. Many of them came into the PNP and I think Joshua is part of the same tradition of that mix of religion and politics--a continuation of a tradition. Coupled with, and in harmony with this is the Rastafarian movement which has come directly out of Bedwardism and Garveyism. Explicity, the Rasta's show their debt to Garvey who had prophesied that they should "look to Ethiopia where a black king would be crowned". The Rasta movement flowered in the sixties and took on very strong political overtones in that it reflected and gave voice to the sentiments of oppression--the desire to be free (whether in a physical removal from Jamaica or in cutting down Babylon). Certainly, Michael Manley's visit to Ethiopia was a very conscious attempt to make a connection with that particular stream.

SIMMS: Was his visit prior to the 1972 election or after?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: It was before the elections, either in the late sixties or early seventies. I think it was shortly after his father's death, and this occurred in September 1969. so his visit must have been in 1970.

In other words, it was just at a time when he was actively preparing for elections. This was at the height of his leadership campaign--a campaign to really establish himself as the alternate Prime Minister. Having just taken over, the first thing was to establish himself as quickly as possible not only in the party but in the public mind. He had three years before the election in order to establish himself. It must also be noted that he didn't confine himself to Ethiopia but he visited a number of African countries, but from a symbolic point of view Ethiopia was the most significant. This was so because it was the country of Haile Selassie--the Jah (God) of the Rastafari. To the Rastafarians, Ethiopia and Africa are one and the same.

SIMMS: Can you clarify how Michael Manley used the symbols that he might have conjured (consciously or unconsciously) by going to Africa; and how these assisted his leadership?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: As I indicated, the context within which he went to Africa is important. Jamaican society in the late sixties and early seventies was significant. 1968 was the year of what came to be popularly labelled the "Rodney Riots". In addition, there was the international rise and spreading of the Black Power Movement, and the dramatic effects of this in the U.S.A. Black leaders such as Stokley Carmichael and Martin Luther King Jr. had a great influence on the politics of the Caribbean in general--and Jamaica had its share of this influence. In 1968, the Black Power Movement was on the rise in Jamaica and the expulsion of Walter Rodney from Jamaica led to serious riots in Kingston. This was not just a reaction because of black power or black consciousness as a cultural phenomenon, but it was an economic and political struggle against economic oppression. It was struggle against the control of the economy by a minority white or near-white class. The Black Power riots showed that people were dissatisfied with the whole economic set-up and they were conscious that the majority of Jamaican people are black and that they are the ones who were still deprived and oppressed. Therefore it was a more conscious coming together of the Africanist stream--Bedward, Garvey and Rastafarianism--into the radical political activist stream. There is a conjucture between this situation and the change of leadership in the PNP.

The business of economic freedom and economic power was clearly on the agenda at the time when the new leader was taking over. Michael Manley, having already established himself as a populist political personality is well equipped to take up this challenge. His visit to Africa must then be seen as a very conscious attempt to make a kind of psychological connection with the masses. He was the first Jamaican political leader to visit Africa. Marcus Garvey had written and spoken about the meaning of Africa, but I am not certain whether he visited Africa or not. This is important to our discussion.

Secondly, not only did Michael Manley visit a number of African countries which had recently achieved independence and showed a symbolic connection of common aspirations, but he made the initial impression for the Third World leadership which he attained at the height of his political career. On his return from Africa, Michael Manley produced a rod that was supposed to have been given to him by Haile Selassie. I don't know to what extent this was consciously planned--whether Selassie gave him the rod or whether he bought it in London or some other centre--what I do know is that Michael Manley could never have imagined the kind of impact and symbolism that this rod would come to have on the Jamaican society. It is only in retrospect that one recognizes the symbolic importance of this and what it came to mean. This rod was really a kind of cane (walking stick) and it was said to have been made of ebony and ivory. When it was first shown to the people at a public meeting it made an unbelievable impact. Subsequently, it became a symbol--it was transformed from a walking stick to a shepherd's rod.

To understand the importance of the shepherd in Jamaican traditional religion and--by extension--politics, one has to see the shepherd as a religious leader of the Revivalist cult. Bedward was a shepherd and so were other religious leaders. Revivalism is important to both Manley and the present Prime Minister, Edward Seaga, who did an academic study of the cult. I think, however, that what Seaga knew academically was what Manley sensed instinctively.

While the Rastafarian cult is a more recent phenomenon, Revivalism has had a longer tradition in Jamaica and through Bedward in the 1920's a closer link was forged between the political and the religious themes as they were defined in the Revivalist Movement. Both Revivalism and Rastafarianism came together in the impact of Michael Manley. This is not something that can easily be objectified or detailed. This is the reason that this phenomenon is so powerful. It operates on an implicit or subconscious level and different analysts might see different meanings in what I am discussing. However, to me, it was obvious that the walking stick had become the shepherd's rod, and the Shepherd is significant to the large Africanist element in the society and further reinforced by the hold of the Christian belief system--Jesus is the good Shepherd who laid down his life for his sheep and so on. Also, David is the Shepherd King who brought Israel to imperial greatness through the comforting attributes of the rod and staff; the ruler's sceptre and, most importantly, "the rod of Moses".

Eventually, Michael Manley and his supporters consciously adapted the rod as Moses' rod--the rod that parted the Red Sea in order that the Israelites be brought to safety and from the bondage of Egypt. Thus, the analogy between the bondage of the African majority in Babylon (Jamaica) is drawn with the biblical account of the bondage of the children of Israel. Egypt and Babylon became symbols of oppression, not geographical locations or cultural entities. Similarly, the child of Israel is merely a symbol for any group which perceives itself as oppressed. Manley could therefore use the symbol of the "rod of Moses" to signal his intention to lead the Jamaican massess across their Red Sea. It is, therefore, not surprising that the nickname that was used locally for Shearer, the Prime Minister (JLP), was Pharoah (pronounced

Pharah in the Jamaican dialect). Thus the PNP under Manley would lead the people from Pharah's rule. On another level, this process was seen not just as freedom from Pharah's (Shearer's) government, but as redemption from a more generalized kind of oppression (social, racial, cultural, economic) which merged into making Jamaica a Babylon. In this process of symbolic transformation, Moses is transformed into Joshua, the one who had to lead his people to the Promised Land. Joshua also had to break down the walls of Jericho. Egypt, Jericho and Babylon merge in this symbolic field to mean a state of oppression, and without any quantum leap Moses was transformed into Joshua. Manley, fondly called Joshua by the people, was understood to be carrying out the task of Moses with his rod.

SIMMS: Is Michael Manley therefore a complex of symbols?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: He is, even though the Joshua image is the one that took on almost a tangible form.

Again, I am saying that I don't know to what extent all this was preplanned or conscious, but certainly the rod that was ostensibly given by Haile Selassie was able to touch many chords and the effect was really startling, and, as I said before, at the time I wasn't really aware of the effect this had had until shortly before the election in 1972 when it was rumoured that the rod had been either stolen or captured by Seaga. Sections of the people were obviously panicking. The PNP had to quickly issue pamphlets describing the rod in great detail and also issued pictures to prove that what Seaga claimed to be the rod was a different object: Seaga's stick was a dirty trick. Joshua's genuine rod was still with its rightful owner.

The problem with this strategy was that the appeal was so generalized and so vague that all kinds of people could see within this anything that they wanted to see. Therefore, people rallied to the cause of the PNP because of the meanings inherent in the symbol. At the same time, when the party won power the expectations of the people were very diverse and the intentions and plans of the government were less than clear-cut. Time was needed to define more narrowly the precise objectives of the government.

SIMMS: Are you saying that this Joshua image engendered the kind of hope that could not be fulfilled in practical terms?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: I am not saying that they could not be fulfilled. It is more a question of whether the leadership wished to fulfill them. In addition, it is also a question of whether what was generally seen by the people as their hopes and aspirations were also what the leadership had in mind; whether the convergence between leader/leaders and led was only on the symbolic level or whether it was well grounded is a major question.

SIMMS: As one who was closely associated with the formal structure of the Party and with the leader himself, did you sense that people were expecting more of the leadership or that the leadership was unaware of the expectations?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: It is very difficult to look back and speculate on what one thought at the time--is what I now see the same as what I did think then? I think that at the time I thought that the leadership was not sufficiently aware of the level of expectations. To put it another way, my own view was that something close to a revolutionary longing or demand was building up, and that they saw Joshua as the person who could fill these revolutionary longings. Manley, however, did not see himself in that role and he did not interpret the revolutionary longings of the people in the way I did. He did not see the revolutionary possibilities. Perhaps he saw himself in the image of the BBC which featured Michael Manley and said something to the effect that the hope of the people will force him to hold back or contain any serious social unrest. For a period of time, he would have some degree of social calm. He was seen as the person with the ability to contain the danger of social unrest.

I really think that perhaps Michael Manley did not appreciate sufficiently the level of his power and what he could have done at the time. He had such strong support among the people that he could have done just about anything at that time. Perhaps all this was a contradiction. A relevant question to consider is whether, if his policies were more specifically delineated, he would have had such massive support. However, without these clear cut policies and plans, widespread popular support could not be utilized in a productive manner.

SIMMS: Did he use the term Democratic Socialism at that point in time?

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER: He did not in 1972. I can recall that when he first ran for election as a member of parliament in 1967, at public meetings he talked about socialism on a few occasions, amongst his working class constituents. I don't recall him speaking about Socialism. He would also not have spoken about the so-called democratic socialism because it was a term that was not in current use until about 1974. The PNP was purported to be a socialist party and had accepted socialism to be one of its goals from as early as 1940, and even with the purge of the Left in 1952, socialism was never abandoned as an objective. It might have been used less frequently by some people. In the mid-sixties there was a renewal of socialist activity within the Party. For instance, the Young Socialist League had an effect on the formulation of certain policies. With the defeat in the 1967 elections these persons became less active within the party and the non-socialists or anti-socialists seemed to have been in ascendancy within the Party, so much so that some of them were advocating not using words such as "comrade" and not using the symbol of the clenched fist.

These are some of the factors that influenced Michael Manley and in some ways predetermined his role and his effectiveness.

CONVERSATION WITH A CLERGYMAN -
A SUPPORTER OF MICHAEL MANLEY AND HIS POLICIES

CLERGYMAN: The concept of National Sovereignty is the key to Manley's leadership. If he has a place in Jamaica's history--distinct from the place of his forerunners and his successors--it will be as the force in the establishment of the Nation as an integrated whole. In reaching this point, Manley emphasized the importance of the postponement of gratification in the achievement of sovereignty, hence he emphasized the concept of Self-Reliance which presupposes a conscious effort at denial of some of the immediate and quick solutions to long-term economic and social well-being.

In theological terms, Manley has the same symbolism for Jamaicans as Moses had for the Jews, and the book, Politics of Change, is more theological than political. It is a suitable text for discussions in ethics, and has been adapted as such in several colleges in the U.S.A. The belief in the politics of participation recognizes that there is potential and expertise in every sector of the society.

Manley has a deep respect for the Jamaican people (the masses), but he also suffers from a sense of shame and a degree of guilt in the Eriksonian model, because of his class origins. His awareness of not being "one of them" is an inhibiting force. In order to make up for this he

a) becomes too dependent on advisors
b) is too hesitant in making certain decisions
c) overcompensates for this perceived weakness by an overtly apologetic stance.

This guilt and shame of his class background is further exhibited in a dependence on approbation and the need for constant "ego massaging". Manley, then, is a man who wants to be praised and because of this he can be very easily demoralized, especially by the print media which capitalized n this personality flaw and set out deliberately to demoralize him, especially during the 1980 election campaign.

FORMER DIPLOMAT - MEMBER OF THE PNP AND A STRONG
SUPPORTER OF MICHAEL MANLEY AND HIS POLICIES

1

SIMMS: I am interested in finding out the kind of person Mr. Manley is, in an effort to analyse the kind of leadership that he gives to his society. Can you tell me something about him?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: He is charismatic. He has a natural appeal, is a tremendous orator and a very principled person. He is also very democratic, and this can be seen as both a strength and a weakness. In this, he dovetails with the party and submits himself to the democratic process, a process for which he has great respect, so much so that he sometimes bows to the wishes of each individual.

SIMMS: Does he strive for consensus?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: Yes, he does. He is extremely opposed to arbitrary acts.

SIMMS: Is he a power-seeker?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: Not in the sense of power. He is very committed to the masses and is somewhat left of centre ideologically.

SIMMS: How far left is he?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: I can only say that he submits himself to the policies of the party and is directed by the Objects and Principles of the Party in order to deal with ideological differences with both the Left and the Right. Mr. Manley has a genuine respect for collective wisdom--in spite of the level of education of his followers.

SIMMS: Is he elitist?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: He is elitist in the sense that he is a creature of his background, but intellectually he is anti-elitist.

SIMMS: Some of his major economic decisions have been severely criticized. Was he incompetent?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: The man is not incompetent. He is a man of great ability. He has the intellectual ability to stick with a process, find a solution and make a decision. Furthermore, he is a good listener, and he hesitates to brush anyone's ideas aside even though he is not a "yes man". During our term in office, all major decisions were Cabinet decisions. It must be appreciated that the People's National Party has a greater influence on government at the present time than at the time of Norman Washington Manley. It is fair to say that the Party controls the Cabinet. In fact, the IMF debate raised serious questions about the Party-Cabinet relationship. These are issues that still need to be ironed out.

On the personal level, Michael Manley reflects in himself the generalized Jamaican character and personality (a degree of aggression and defiance especially in defense of principles). The perception held of him as a champion of Castro and Cuba's cause is largely due to the fact that he has a very strong mind of his own and is a man of great integrity. He overtly exhibits defiance against any form of oppression.

SIMMS: Is Race an issue in Manley's appeal?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: His parents were both champions of racial equality, however, his obvious colour and background might have raised questions as to the extent or the degree to which this would be a problem. Colour is seen in Jamaica as an attitude rather than as a shade of skin.

SIMMS: What makes Michael Manley a distinctive Jamaican leader?

FORMER DIPLOMAT: The extent to which he has created in Jamaicans an awareness of themselves and of their own importance. Manley has a strong sense of Jamaican nationalism and a pride which is felt beyond the level of his supporters.

TECHNOCRAT AND PARTY SUPPORTER

SIMMS: What are some of the qualities that you have observed about Michael Manley as a leader?

TECHNOCRAT: In the first place, his style is marked by the fact that action must be informed by some factual premise. In other words, he makes his decisions on the basis of facts. It is in this sense that I think he shows a great deal of respect for technocrats and he likes to be surrounded by them. He is also very sharp and very clear on technocratic issues, therefore the technocrats who congregate around him must themselves be able to give solid technical advice. All this is to say that he firstly bases his policies on technocratic premises but he himself is very discriminating in the kind of technologies to be used. This, then, is one style, and in this he endears himself to technocrats and they in turn relate very easily to him.

Another notion, of course, is that he believes explicitly in the power, the force and the creativity of the masses. This leads him to want always to involve them in processes that are likely to affect their lives. The one thing that comes out very, very strongly, in my identification with him, is that he helps the ordinary man to understand his own sense of competence in influencing, changing and affecting his environment. I think that it is this belief in the masses that has endeared them to him and vice versa. On the one level--that of the technocrat--and on the level of the masses, one can observe two influences on Michael Manley's leadership style.

SIMMS: How is this carried over into the formal structure of the People's National Party?

TECHNOCRAT: The party has a firm democratic tradition and Norman Manley, the founder, was very concerned about building such a tradition. In this respect, he carefully laid the institutions and processes within the party which would deflect any emphasis on a personality. There is no doubt that Michael Manley falls within this democratic tradition, and that his identification with the union movement further reinforced that kind of commitment. What he has done is to build on the democratic ethos which he inherited from his father. He was, therefore, always concerned about institution building of a democratic kind, and since he assumed leadership of the party he has changed the trajectory somewhat. For instance, he has installed the principle of commissions through which selected issues can be examined by selected groups of people. On the level of candidate selection, he always insisted that the party organization should throw-up the candidates rather than for them to be selected by him or by the National Executive Council. This kind of requirement led to an emphasis on grassroots organization and furthered the democratic process. In other words, Michael Manley has maintained and further developed the party structure in order to give it democratic expression.

On the level of broad policies, my experience has been that at the top levels within the party all policies (major and minor) are discussed to their fullest limits. Thus the party takes quite some time in the generation of its agenda. When we look at some of the community-based organizations we see that these go beyond the mere management of a task to a direct input into policies of programs and issues of national significance.

SIMMS: How much weight must we put on Michael Manley's influence being tied to his background?

TECHNOCRAT: I think that there is no doubt that there is a charismatic component to his leadership. Some of this comes from his background, some comes from his acute articulate style and some comes from his obvious concern with uplifting the conditions of the masses. However, charisma has to be validated and I think that Manley has attempted to validate this by developing an ideology which is of central interest to the people--to their lives and possibilities. He formulated an ideological point of view which addressed the basic problem of the people. They therefore rallied around him. The fact that he has changed the trajectory of Jamaican public policy and changed the whole pattern of how advice is given to government by not depending on the advice of the traditional power class is important. He has induced black people with skills and competence into the policy-making process. He has canvassed the opinions of the ordinary people--farmers, higglers and all the traditional substrates of the society. One must understand this relationship to the people not simply in terms of the tendencies of the Jamaican masses to rally around people and symbols which are identified with the upper class, but in the fact that Michael Manley has attempted to validate his charisma through practical expressions of ideological rhetoric.

SIMMS: Michael Manley has been criticised for not being decisive on many crucial issues. Is this a real issue of not?

TECHNOCRAT: It is a complex issue and in effect this tendency to vacillate, to fence sit, to be indecisive and sometives to reverse decisions, is a general feature of the post-colonial state. It is a feature of this state because, relative to other forces within the society, the political force is very weak. In other words, those who represent the state are relatively weak. They have to contend with important social forces that have politically relevant resources and that are experienced in political participation. The classes within the state have differing access to resources. The working class from which the post-colonial leader draws support, has very limited economic resources. This is an important factor.

Another feature of the post-colonial state is that the state must respond to many competing and conflicting interests. Those who represent the state must therefore vacillate. In other words, the nature of the post-colonial state forces leaders to sit on the fence, and in addition to this, those who represent the state have come to feel that they represent the interest of the whole nation and that is very critical in this matrix. Their policies are therefore an admixture of non-class politics and narrow nationalism. That is one structural factor on the nature of the post-colonial state. This is one of the reasons why Manley has tended to vacillate and fence sit. I also think that if we look at his performance over time, we can see that the sources of the policy advice have been rather varied. On the other hand, in the JLP one can see a central source of advice--the business technocratic class. In Manley's case, the sources of advice are multiple--from the technocrats, from the grassroots and from different social forces within the society. He has the difficulty of securing the mix and this causes the vacillation and the indecisiveness and so on. Thirdly, we have to look at the character of the People's National Party. It is notoriously a party of tendencies. The two dominant ones are the left leaning and the right-oriented tendencies. These two assume dominance and hegemony at particular periods of time. Therefore, when the left is in ascendancy, the policy regime will tend to lean in that direction; when the right is in ascendancy, the regime leans to a rightist position. This is a mere responding to those ideological pressures within the party. On top of all this, the model has been muddled on several occasions because there have been many instances in which Michael Manley has acted with decisiveness in spite of which group os pressuring him. Between 1972 and 1980, he demonstrated that certain issues were non-negotiable. For instance, the issue of the state playing a major role in the economy was clear-cut. On this there was no vacillation, even though at the same time, he did accommodate the private sector interest and forces. He made it clear that the state would take command of the basic productive resources.

In so far as Manley felt that the workers, peasants and broad masses should have a more central role in the definition and implementation of certain policies through community-based organizations, he also proved to be decisive. The co-ops were built, community councils were formed and student councils were realized, and several other major changes were made. Steps were taken with great precision and decisiveness.

I am therefore saying that in understanding Manley's vacillation in some cases, there were certain non-negotiable issues. These issues were not only local, some were international. For instance, on the issue of relationship with Cuba, the middle classes were not supportive. Manley, however, explained why his party and himself insisted on those relationships.

Thus any vacillation or fence sitting that is observed must be seen as a feature of the post-colonial state and, in Manley's case, a complicating factor has to do with the nature of the People's National Party. A third factor is his own style of drawing policy advice from varying sources. In balancing these interests he then appears to be indecisive.

SIMMS: Is the powerful leader looming above everyone else a weakness of Third World politics in that the focus is on one person rather than on the development of a number of persons to carry out leadership?

TECHNOCRAT: Yes, I think you are quite right. There is a tendency in the Third World generally for the one leader to dominate the stage, and the special problem for the political process is that not much attention is paid to building second tier leadership--a second cadre of successor leaders does not emerge naturally. In Manley's case, the situation is tempered somewhat by the fact that there appear to be some alternative people who themselves have a power base and who have a national standing and who are technically able and are themselves generally respected. Manley has not isolated these persons from the central stage. There is, therefore, a sharp sense in which his leadership style is collective though in effect he dominates or can dominate the process. For instance, in observing the PNP's national conference you may have noticed that even when certain issues could have been resolved by acclamation, he has insisted on the democratic vote. The present political issue (the non-contest of the December 15th election) is a case in point. The National Executive Council wanted to endorse non-contest by acclamation and Manley insisted on the decision being taken by secret ballot. This of course does not negate the thrust of your point that a problem remains when there is a powerful charismatic leader who dominates the political process. It has the effect of other leaders leaving all announcements and pronouncements to him so that he comes to gain an all-embracing image. He announces the major policies in industry, commerce, agriculture and all other fields. This tends to detract from the ministers who hold these portfolios and strengthens the central leader. This can have very serious negative consequences on public policy and how they operate. Also on the administrative level this practice generates a kind of defensive insecurity on the part of civil servants. They fear making decisions and they become less anxious to take risks for fear of making errors and for fear of departing from policy positions. This can be explained by the fact that the dominant leader has developed the process and the style of main articulator and main conceptuallizer. The civil service technocrats have tended to back off for this reason--defensive insecurity.

In short, I am saying that this continued dominance has potential negative effect in so far as it depresses the emergence of second tier leadership and therefore the succession problem is likely to emerge. In Manley's case, the fact that the process that he manages is institutionalized in the party would cause an easy transition in the event that he steps down.

SIMMS: Does Michael Manley maintain a high profile internationally even when he is no longer nationally popular?

TECHNOCRAT: An essential part of Manley's leadership style is the universalism which he brings to politics. He conceptualizes the Third World as a special unit that, despite some basic dissimilarities, shares basic historical experience and social conditions. In his advocacy for social justice locally, he links up with international questions. When he talks about retrieving the Jamaican patrimony he links this with the need for other states in the Third World to do the same. This universalism has to do with how he conceptualizes development problems. These he does not see as national in any comprehensive sense; they have their local national expressions, but they are universal and if the conditions are to be managed domestically, then the international context must change. In other words, he feels that what happens in the realm of management of oil, for instance, has implications for how bauxite is managed. He sees these linkages and he is attempting to build a development process which has implications for development elsewhere.

Manley's attention to international issues is, in the Jamaican system, both a strength and a weakness because the opposition party used his efforts to demonstrate that he was not interested in local problems. They accused him of trying to build an international image for himself. However, the reverence and the respect that he gets outside of Jamaica, attest to the viability of his approach.

SIMMS: There are aspects of Manley's development that are intriguing.

For instance, the prominence of his parents and his mulitple marriages could be clues to his leadership style. Do you wish to comment on how these factors have affected him?

TECHNOCRAT: There may be merit to the proposition that his background and upbringing have influenced him. He obviously grew up with a great deal of self confidence and a lot of attention as well. Also, the nature of his career development suggests that he must have become accustomed to adulation and to people using him as a central reference point. He moved from the home to the trade union field and eventually to politics as leader of the opposition and, eventually, to Prime Minister of his country. All these platforms lend themselves to making one get accustomed to adulation and attention. On the other side, all this carries a cost. It means that one in this situation has to behave and perform in a way that will engender an sustain this attention. This has been one of the very serious demands on Michael Manley.

I cannot meaningfully comment on his personal life, but in the raw political world, I know for sure that he likes to have people around him. He enjoys the dynamics of this interaction. If I understand his personality, I would say that Michael Manley will work very hard to retrieve his lost political stature. I am quite confident that his absence in Parliament will not diminish his presence in the society.

Michael Manley up to this point has made one central contribution in that he has managed to arrest the sense of alienation by defining a political movement and inculcating a political consciousness and an awareness of the wider world and the relationship to the Jamaican society. Relatedly, he had inducted people into meaningful collective and productive tasks, and that has helped to cement and retrieve some lost ground.

The decision not to contest the election will place new and more exacting organizational burdens on the party. The leadership realizes that and I think we will see a revitalization of party organization and structure.

ECONOMIST AND FORMER PNP SUPPORTER

ECONOMIST: It is one thing for the Cabinet to say "We will open relationships with the Soviet Union", for example, and then the Foreign Ministry puts a higher priority on visiting the U.S.A. and puts someone who is not only ignorant but unsympathetic on preparing the Soviet mission. This must give a negative signal to the Soviets. Why should they come in and help you service your way back into the arms of the U.S.A.? The contradictory forces that Manley led--those forces cannot get anything implemented as long as he is trying to balance them and hold them into a unity. Nothing can be done.

SIMMS: Are these forces within the Jamaican society?

ECONOMIST: Within this society. Now, if Michael makes a break with that alliance and decides to side with a section of that alliance against the rest, then you can come up with some things that are possible. For instance, the possibility of going against the landlord. Michael Manley will not do that. I don't know why, but I would speculate that ultimately he has more fears of the landlord forces than the anti-landlord forces.

SIMMS: Is this a class alliance?

ECONOMIST: This is where, to explain the subjective in terms of the leadership and in particular Michael's limitations, class and race must come into that explanation. Also to explain the objective limitation that he was operating with--again class and race must come into it, but this time one must look at the composition of the forces that support him. The fact of the matter is that when the leftists are walking out one door, the rightists are walking in through the other--pulling him in two directions.

SIMMS: Some others have emphasized the class/race issue as a contradiction within the society and as a contradiction within Michael Manley himself. This might be reflected in his class alliances. Can Manley, in your opinion, dislocate himself from his class lineage and give his heart to the working class?

ECONOMIST: That is the kind of thing that could be probed in an interview with the man himself, and with people who are close to him. These kinds of questions must be answered. To what extent has he been unable to break with his class/race background? The evidence seems to say that in a deeply subconscious psychic way, when under pressure, he retreats to his enclave of confidants who, on the whole, look like him.

SIMMS: From the point of view of an economist, did you see some real problems with his economic programs?

ECONOMIST: He had good ideas and good programs. The problem was that the planning system went one way and the political process another. So one can come up with any plan that can be intrinsically good, but which will have no meaning unless the finance is there for it to be implemented. With the IMF running the budget and the planners running the plans--the two shall never meet; This is a structural problem within the Jamaican system and until these forces can be brought together through bureaucratic changes (struggles within the bureaucracy--which is a political problem in and of itself), then no planning or program can have any meaning. Meaning can only be had through the budget process, but the budget process has been unsympathatic to change. This present process was developed to service the colonial economy. It cannot be changed, "Garlic cannot be diced with a machete". It is too cumbersome. It can't handle the kinds of changes that were needed. The budget process was under the control of the IMF since April 1977, and controlled by sympathetic forces to the IMF long before that. The success or unsuccess of the program per se must be understood against the dynamics of the social system. A social system in which there is no way to monitor certain kinds of projects outside of a politically conscious climate where people's social conscience, for instance, would look at crash programs or other programs and work at them. There is no way that the state can possibly manage those kinds of things. Of crash programs the critic might ask, "Why not get people to do something more productive like growing food?" The answer to this question is related to the fact that there is no place in the city to grow food. Even if open spaces are identified, the water commission would tell you that, because of the threat of drought, no water can be used. The next question is, "Who will supervise the growing of the crops?" This is a project that cannot afford a person who deserves or earns $35,000.00 for such a job. One must then take a lower level person and run the risk of organizational problems. It is therefore not the technical economics of Manley's programs that was wrong. It could not have been. In fact, it was the best technical side that the country has ever had working for it. The answer lies in getting a social system not structured against social change. To carry out social change in an atmosphere (nationally and internationally) particularly hostile to social change presents logistic problems.

Take the case of the Food Farmers. The government ran food farms and there is no doubt that they were extremely productive. However, we must face the fact that the senior officers as well as the workers sold off the crops for their individual benefit. Thus the social system was not able to police itself. There was no moral authority nor did the government have the fire power to police the food farms, especially those in the more remote areas. Now one can argue that this food was reaped and consumed. However, the government lost money and, from the point of view of a business enterprise, it was unsuccessful. These are narrow level analyses. From a broader level, the process can be viewed from a broad level of general nutrition--and see that there was more food available to the needy sector of the population.

In short, Manley's technical programs were sound, their problems related to coordinating such programs in a social system where there are hostile forces, a low level of political consciousness and a system in which people feel no responsibility towards state property. It is also understandable why the majority of the people acted in this way. At the same time, some of the big farmers were the main ones "ripping off the system". When the government tractor is sent to work on the government farm and is used to do work on the big private farm for as long as possible (and with no costs incurred to the private farmer) how can anyone tell the small farmer and the peasant that they must not steal a bag of potatoes or a sack of fertilizer. How can one tell such a person that this is wrong?

Ironically, the wrath of the society is always against the man who steals the sack of potatoes. The society says nothing about the man who has the $100,000 tractor with a broken part on his farm for months or the one who keeps the one peanut thrasher that is supposed to service the whole parish. Society does not sanction such a person. Why? Because he is big time red man farmer so no one says anything. One therefore has to ask oneself, "What could have been done under those circumstances?" If Manley had been prepared to move against the big farmers, then everyone would see this and gain confidence in the possibility of a change.

There is more moral authority in the society with regards to the protection of private property than with regards to public property. Quite understandably, if a man trespasses on my land and I shoot him, then nothing happens. Everyone understands. On the other hand, if the state shoots him then the state is wicked. Because of the insufficient political education in the society, there has never been any respect for public property, and until the society reaches the stage where there is a kind of moral disapproval of the plundering of state property beyond the legal and police sanctions, then the problem will remain unsolvable.

For instance, you might say that cooperatives in sugar was a bad thing from the point of view of the changes in the economic circumstances in which the cooperatives were established. They came into a more and more hostile economic climate and from the fact that the largest organization in the sugar industry is the BITU (Bustamante Industrial Trade Union) and if its workers became cooperators, then it would lose dues. Therefore this body had to sabotage the cooperators. So from within the industry, those who were union delegates and leaders and so on, and who were now losing out within democratic processes to untried cooperators prone to making mistakes, had to prevent the system from working. Systemic breakdowns within a period of transition is inevitable. If we look objectively at the financial viability of those farms we realize that no matter who was running them they were set up for failure. One can make the argument that it was a callous thing to establish these co-ops, because the workers were forced to obsorb the losses. I think the criterion for the failure of the co-ops is not whether they made money or not. After all, people do not denounce private enterprise just because a particular business loses money.

I feel that undoubtedly there were technical mistakes in programs, but such mistakes were not the crucial forces in the failure of the Manley government. The crucial issue was that of trying to get new economic programs implemented in a social system that is unsympathetic to changes, hostile in some cases, incapable of managing change, particularly in difficult circumstances.

What does one do when, for instance, there is one water system that carries water to a farm of cooperators and also to a big private farm? The big private owner "buys out" the pump operator and the co-op farm is not supplied with water. This causes the cooperators not to be able to produce. In not producing they cannot pay back their loans, they are then labelled as irresponsible operations. In this case, the local internal dynamics and relationships can easily be missed.

Now, if the state does not have moral authority to lock down the pumping station and arrest the guilty parties, thus setting an example so that such practices will cease, the system will crumble, deteriorate and fall apart.

I think the problem is along these kinds of subtle difficulties in getting new programs through a biased system that was not geared to collect taxes and police private property. To get such a system to work requires political changes. Under Manley, the political will to change might have been there at some stage, but it faded very quickly. Those kinds of changes within the social system were needed.

SIMMS: Are you suggesting that Manley should have made those changes?

ECONOMIST: A whole heap of change--he should have chopped down the bureaucracy, or reorganized the bureaucracy. For instance, you shouldn't have a situation in which the Department of Statistics operates independently of the National Planning Unit. The information from statistics is supposed to support the planning system. What is collected should be dictated by the planning system. Statistics operate in a separate field, the planning system operates in a separate field, and the Ministry of Finance is independent of both. The best that was possible during the time was an informal collaboration that was dependent on the personalities of some key workers who worked out working relationships with all departments so that there was some recognition that all three departments needed to work closely together.

In other words, no worker in the planning unit could demand or insist on any information from the other departments.

SIMMS: Was this a traditional bureaucratic practice that became a block to progress?

ECONOMIST: Yes

SIMMS: Was Michael Manley totally unaware of these internal issues?

ECONOMIST: No, but it was the politics of the whole system.

SIMMS: The politics?

ECONOMIST: How would he remove one corrupt top level civil servant? If this was done, the outcry from the Permanent Secretary would be such that this would be seen as government interference.

On the other hand, the present regime has come in and done unprecedented things--fired people, laid them off and "turned them out to pasture" and moved them around. This is in contrast to a case in which Michael Manley moved a corrupt, inefficient and incompetent man. This caused such an outcry that Manley had strength only for the Left after this. He would have fired anyone from the Left in a minute.

SIMMS: What is it about the two regimes (Manley's and Seaga's) that caused the same action to be acceptable now but not then?

ECONOMIST: Moral Authority. Manley ruled by consensus. Seaga doesn't give a damn what anybody thinks. Additionally, he (Seaga) had moral authority when he first came in. Everyone believed that prior to this there was pure corruption and inefficiency. Such moral authority quickly dissipated but now people feel that it is useless to object because their opinion is not valued. Michael Manley's style is different. He is extremely sensitive to consensus and public opinion. When he came again to power in 1976, he came with a rising crescendo of support for and from the Left. However, he really spent his political time "clipping the wings" of the Left rather than addressing the Right.

SIMMS: Why did he feel so threatened by the left?

ECONOMIST: I don't know. After a while, he believed that there was a conspiracy coming from the Left, but I don't think he had this belief at the outset. This is something that was fabricated as time went on. The only explanation that I can give is that (1) he was afraid that Left sympathies would alienate the U.S.A. support and he wanted to recultivate the U.S.; (2) he was afraid that the policies of the Left would necessarily come to make the country more and more democratic and would open a kettle of fish that would be hard to control after a time. I think he had great fear of that kind of democratic process. For example, it is one thing for Manley to say that Members of Parliament should be chosen democratically, but if this is carried to its logical conclusion--then if it is the Left that is organizing--the people might choose all Leftists, and this would backfire on him. This is what was happening. The Left had organized so well that they were getting a very different kind of leadership being thrown up from the grass roots--they were getting different kinds of intellectuals now serving. There were still technocrats who were serving, but I think Manley feared that a dynamic would develop that would move too much against the private sector for his liking. The country was becoming very polarized and hostilities were building up and Manley really defended the private sector objectively.

In retrospect, the whole exercise of the Emergency Production Planning, as far as I see it, was to keep the Left occupied by giving them a task. If they did not carry out this task, then they would be discredited and their failure would prove that the country had no alternative but to go with the IMF. On the other hand, if the Left was kept busy, then they would have no time to do anything else. This was an effective way of "stringing up" the Left.

Maybe the party members might be able to give better insights into how this played itself out even before the 1980 elections in terms of the selection of the government and in terms of support for certain candidates. By the time he was elected, there was a certain perception.

The present general secretary of the party posed an interesting question after Manley's 1976 victory. He asked whether this victory was a mandate for Socialism. To which Manley replied, "This is a mandate for Nothing." Even then one could see in his mood that he sensed that the Left was becoming too powerful. Of course, the path of Social Democcracy is a "see-saw" one. If the Left is coming up too strong, then you chop it down and support the Right; if the Right is coming on too strong, chop it down and woo the Left--a kind of balancing act.

By the time the Left within the Party lost influence early in 1980, Manley quickly accelerated his Left posture and brought in Samora Michel and Fidel Castro in an effort to counterbalance the Right. However, bringing in these two persons took interesting twists. Samora Michel gave the most eloquent and rousing speech--one that dovetailed with the whole history of the PNP, but most important was the fact that the sight of a black (coal black) African talking about Socialism made a whole lot of difference to the Jamaican masses. Socialism was usually associated with the white and brown people, and here was a black revolutionary Socialist not miming formulas from the Soviet Union or anywhere else, but expounding on ideas that came out of his own reality. This was a very powerful speech. "Man ran for cover after that speech".

Then Manley brought Fidel about three weeks later and, in contrast to Michel, he gave a very conservative, calming and subdued speech. Thus even this Left escalation was balanced. Obviously, the briefing that was given to Michel made him go one way and Castro's briefing made Fidel go another.

SIMMS: Would colour play any symbolic role in this scenario?

ECONOMIST: One has to be careful how one does such an analysis. For instance, I overheard a coal black Rastafarian remark that he thought "Michael was a blacker man than Fidel, but Fidel is a blacker man than Michael". So obviously it is not the colour of skin that is being discussed--not the phenotype colour--but what was perceived in what Fidel said--how the content related to the listener's experience. It is a very complex issue, very, very complex. Michael, after all, was seen as a champion of the aspirations of black people. He is seen that way.

SIMMS: Is colour then an attitude rather than a shade of skin?

ECONOMIST: It is both. They can't be completely separated, and it is quite possible to have the opposite. For instance, the phenotypically black Glasspole (Governor General) is usually described as a white man--"a queen man dat"--"a black man with a white heart". Therefore you can see that this is a very complex issue. But it is also true that if there had been a very black man with the kind of charisma and presence of Samora Michel promoting Socialism in Jamaica, there can be no doubt where this country would have gone; no doubt where this country would have gone. I think that the kind of moral authority that a charismatic leader has is very important to the process of social and political change.

Manley's main problem is that he left everybody confused. In contrast, Seaga, who succeeded him, brought certainty--promises of the good old days--food, all kinds of ways to profits, etc. So people grabbed the opportunity. Manley also suffered because the Right wing of the Party carried out active sabotage. They sabotaged in many ways but, crucially, they did no work--none whatsoever. For instance, the then Minister of Finance did nothing about the budget. I sat in with him several times, and it was amazing that even the most fundamental issues were not dealt with. Of course, budget processes, like many others within an established bureaucratic structure, grind ahead without making changes. Changes are never made unless you have the kind of personalities that are prepared to buck the system. Of course, to buck the system requires a kind of political will that Michael Manley may have had at one stage, but perhaps he felt that he did not have the party behind him, and in fact he ran all kinds of contradictory policies--all kinds of contradictions. It is one thing to say "yes, we are going to the Soviet Union" and then whisper to Patterson to slow it down within the Department of Foreign Affairs. Michael did things like that. It is true. In all this, I think he hs really a symbol of the forces that he represented (holding them together).

SIMMS: Was he the first leader that was required to balance the forces in such a way? Is this a factor of time?

ECONOMIST: The time was right. Manley came to power in 1972--ten years after independence. A period in which hardships were increasing and tremendous repression against the poor was a fact of life. Somehow his personality galvanized, challenged and pulled together the most disparate elements; everyone went behind him--all the businessmen, the youth, the women, children, black people, brown people--everybody supported him. Now it is easy to say that "He caused it", but Manley could not cause it. In fact, he might have held back that upswing that was coming by challenging it in a constructive way. For instance, by putting a Rastafarian on T.V., then there was no need for members of the sect to stay outside of the T.V. station and "chant it down" anymore. In a sense, he legitimized a lot of popular sentimemts.

SIMMS: In legitimizing them, did he also neutralize them?

ECONOMIST: I think so.

SIMMS: Is this a distinctively different process from, say, what Seaga is now doing with Revivalism?

ECONOMIST: Yes, because in one case, one is the natural upsurge of the population to which Manley responded. In the other case, Seaga is manipulating forms that are dying out because the bases for them are also dying out. So he is manipulating to seek legitimacy for himself as someone who is working for the African Revival element. He is also hot. You see, Revivalism as an African retention doesn't threaten anything. It is quaint, cute and diversionary. Rastafari, as a cultural manifestation, is different because your own childreen are the leaders of the society and therefore that is challenging. The fear in Jamaica from the Right is the fusion of the nationalist spirit of Rastafari and Socialism. Grenada was a representative of this. This was the only place where "dreadlocks" were in the army. What Grenada also shows is that that fusion came apart. If the fusion takes place in Jamaica now, every white man, Chinaman and all reactionaries will have to run.

SIMMS: Is Revivalism appealing to the passive acceptance of outer world sentiments?

ECONOMIST: Both the Right and Left had elements to tap into, and they tapped selectively. Those two forces--Revivalism at one end of the spectrum, and Rastafari at the other, and in between is a whole spectrum of the cultures of the Jamaican people. Everybody falls somewhere in between. It is very clear that Seaga cultivated the one that suited his ideological stance. Another reason for his choice is that the traditional JLP support has been amongst the peasants who are the ones most involved in such religious practices. Undoubtedly, his academic work amongst them gave him an insight into the character of the population that allows him to respond to the "strong pastor, strong shepherd, who interprets on behalf of the people". I think he sees himself as that kind of person--"the interpreter for the ignorant black people".

SIMMS: Is Manley's "Joshua" also an interpreter?

ECONOMIST: No, his is more a dialoguing role in which he shows more respect to people's ability to contribute. He genuinely has a respect for Democracy. A genuine respect for domocracy, even though he fears what the democratic movement would mean to him. Seaga has no such respect. They are very different in that sense. Manley had been more for people's self respect and people's self-determination. Seaga has just mashed that down.

SIMMS: Given the dynamics of these two personalities, and the responses of the Jamaican population, what do you see as the future? Will things come again full circle?

ECONOMIST: No, I don't think Michael Manley will go any further Left. He has gone Left as far as he can ever go. The problem would be very different of those two personalities were not there. For instance, if they both retire, it will be a completely different picture.

SIMMS: Are you saying that the picture will only change when both of them leave the political arena?

ECONOMIST: It won't necessarily change then. It won't change as long as their personalities dominate those parties.

TRADE UNIONIST

TRADE UNIONIST: I have been with this union since 1952, approximately six months after it came on stream. I came as a field staff and, unlike many of the present day staff who have specialized training at the University, those of us who came on in the early days had to depend on overseas courses. Through these, and the age old method of trial and error, and with much reading, I made myself familiar with the organization of the union and developed a good deal of material of trade union education. Since 1962, the union has established an educational department.

In the early days of the union, the question of personality was of tremendous significance to the society and to the workers. Two men of outstanding personality at the time were Michael Manley and Hugh Shearer. There was a sort of personality rivalry between these two individuals. Each wanted to emerge with the better contract in any labor negotiation. They therefore developed a sort of "leap frog" as each tried to better the other. It was, in a way, a healthy competition, but it created a kind of wage spiralling which at the time the society could not afford because the workers were so far behind.

When one speaks of concepts at different points in time, one realizes that these concepts are not necessarily new but were dormant and were waiting for the right time and the right place to emerge. For instance, the first concept developed with great force and power through the instrumentality of Michael Manley was the concept of "ability to pay". Many people take this for granted today, but in 1947 the Trade Union Congress (TUC) made one of the earliest efforts to challenge the Daily Gleaner to pay its employees' wages in accordance with its ability to pay higher rates than those of the established minimum rates for the printing trade. This attempt failed because an arbitrator awarded against them. This was due to the social thinking of the time, and does not negate the effort of the negotiator. In 1953, when the National Workers' Union organized the bauxite industry at a time when this industry was paying wages consistent with the agricultural sector, in other words, a multinational body that would, in American, pay its workers a dollar per unit of time, was paying the Jamaican workers ten cents for the same unit. This practice was challenged by the NWU and Michael Manley was in charge of these negotiations and he made the claim that, based on the company's ability to pay, that it must not rely on the going rates of an impoverished society. Rather it should depend on its ability to pay decent wages so that the employees can enjoy a decent standard of living, etc., etc.

This concept became the most dynamic force of organizing and negotiating at that time. For the first time [we] became aware of the idea of "the ability to pay". Of course, sectors of the society screamed at the MWU and at Michael Manley and accused them of trying to wreck the economy of the country, arguing that if the bauxite company had to pay according to its ability then others would have to follow suit. Anyway, the consequence was that, following a six weeks' strike, we had an arbitration and out of this the arbitrator partially acknowledged the concept. It was a partial victory for the union even though we did not get the wage rates that we wanted. Through this process, the union movement tackled and gained recognition through this question of ability to pay. All our negotiations, save and except later in the 1970's when wage policies were legislated, were based entirely on the concept of one's ability to pay.

The NWU, under Michael Manley as island supervisor, also emerged and developed the whole question of Maternity Leave. That is not to say that attempts at this had not been made earlier, but under the NWU, the arguments were better articulated. When Michael Manley sat at the bargaining table, he enunciated in the most magnificent terms, an entire new range of concepts and thought. He made it clear that in a society which in one breath states that a woman is of great importance to society, also penalizes her for her normal biological functions by forcing her to decide between having a baby or having a job. That was the sort of new kind of thought that was engineered and entered into the whole concept of maternity leave. Employers began one by one to conform until it became common custom through legal recognition.

A whole range of benefits and provisions, including the question of a man's right to have his job, were highlighted by Michael Manley in 1964. The dominant concept developed was that "a man's job is his property" and no one had the right to deny a man of his property. It was argued that a man's job is the only means by which he can survive and therefore when one arbitrarily takes a man's job away he is robbing him of a fundamental right. Furthermore, if a man is charged with a misdemeanor, he should be given a chance to defend himself, and if a man was found to be wrongfully dismissed from a job, then the man should be entitled to have his job back.

At that particular time in our history, we were governed by the "master and servants" law and, under this law, no matter how wrong the employers were, they were not obliged to rehire a man who had been fired. On these issues, Michael Manley gave the most fluent presentations as a negotiator. He argued eloquently on the sanctity of arbitration and the right of the worker to enjoy the award that the arbitrator has handed down.

Michael Manley, through these negotiations, contributed in a fundamental way to the development of the society. The prestige of the NWU was enhanced by the personality and ability of such a leader. Society was very critical in the early days of the movement and public opinion meant a lot. There were some top level employers or attorneys who would refuse or would be reluctant to negotiate with anyone else besides Manley or Shearer. This necessarily created a bottleneck. Some people were being denied the opportunity to negotiate while the two leaders were being overworked. Even the workers themselves developed a feeling and an attitude of being let down if they did not have Michael Manley or Hugh Shearer around the bargaining table. That means that people who have comparable negotiation skills had to work twice as hard to get to do the job.

Gradually, we broke through this attitude by talking to Michael Manley and pointing out how unwise this path was. We insisted that he alone could not do so much negotiation. We had to make people like the Ashenheims and the Judahs know that they have to sit down with anyone that was appointed by the union. We managed this breakthrough and became extremely successful and subsequently negotiated some landmark contracts based on the concepts that we had developed. Michael Manley not only set the standards for these negotiations, but he established a whole code of behaviours for delegates at the workplace and at the bargaining table. He was the first to identify the delegate as an integral part of every collective bargaining. He set the pace and other unions followed. This was one of his great contributions and he went about it with great determination.

SIMMS: Do you think it was the class values within the Jamaican society that made Michael Manley more acceptable to both the powerclass and the working class? In other words, why did the Ashenheims and the Judahs find him more desirable at the bargaining table?

TRADE UNIONIST: In a sense that was so, but Manley's individual personal mannerisms and skill, coupled with the fact that he was the son of Norman Manley and also island supervisor of the union, made him the top man. The employers therefore wanted to deal with the top, they did not want to think that they were dealing with a lower range of leadership type. Gradually, they had to be forced to deal with the person selected by the union. The workers also had to be educated to understand that they could not always have the leader, but had to accept whoever was appointed to represent them.

SIMMS: Was Michael Manley's commitment to Democracy a significant factor in the sharing of leadership within the Union?

TRADE UNIONIST: During his participation in the union, he came across as a very humble person. His association with the workers has been highlighted by what is locally called "heavy manners". He approached people with great tolerance and respect for their feelings. He had a great deal of sensitivity to people. He insisted on the democratic process and was influential in the union structure. He saw to it that the union developed along those lines. At times he could be criticized for being over democratic.

SIMMS: How did a man of Manley's background manage to become so effective amongst the working class or grassroots people?

TRADE UNIONIST: People sometimes make this mistake of thinking that this is impossible, but a man might have grown up in a palace and never seen a ghetto yet he can understand the conditions of the ghetto. Sometimes when one is brought up in affluent circumstances, one might be quicker to comprehend the misery and suffering of someone like the sugar estate worker. Someone from the identical background of the worker might have first hand knowledge of the worker's experience, but psychologically is trying to escape from the situation and therefore cannot offer the help that someone from a more affluent class can. In our Jamaican society and in the trade union movement, the leadership did not initially come from the grassroots. It came from outside of the worker's experience. This has been part of our historical development. It took time for leadership to emerge from within the ranks of the trade union, therefore in the early days, even the workers themselves would have rejected leadership from within their ranks. This was demonstrated by Bustamante's ascendancy over St. Wiliam Grant, even though the latter was from amongst the workers.

Traces of this attitude can be found in all aspects of Jamaica's political development. Because of this one cannot blame people like Michael Manley and Hugh Shearer for the fact that they assumed leadership. Their leadership was, in fact, thrust upon them. Their reaction to the role becomes the crucial factor, and both have shown that they were capable of giving effective leadership to the working class. It is therefore debatable whether class background is the determining factor in all of this. Michael Manley was very popular and very much at home with the sugar worker, more than with any other group of workers. He seemed to understand these instinctively and they also understood him.

SIMMS: Is the NWU an arm of the PNP?

TRADE UNIONIST: No, it is not an arm of the People's National Party, it is constitutionally associated with the party. In other words, even though it is not formally spelled out, there is a special relationship between the union and the party. Each negotiation is autonomous because it would not be wise for a trade union to be an arm of a political party at this stage of our development. We were once affiliated, but we moved beyond that to an associate relationship. In this structure, the union retains and ensures the right to dissent and to oppose any political action that does not favour the trade union movement.

SIMMS: Did Michael Manley gain prominence within the PNP because of his profile within the NWU?

TRADE UNIONIST: I would express the point of view very strongly, that his leadership within the union contributed to his rise in the PNP. I think that his whole attitude to government and many of the social reforms were a direct result and a consequence of his trade union experience.

SIMMS: It has been argued that he was more effective as a trade union leader than as a Prime Minister. Do you share this view?

TRADE UNIONIST: If this is true, then the trade union should be given a "pat on the back". However, trade unionism is different from other political activities in that the major aspect of unions is negotiation. Politics are more fluid and more unpredictable, also politics are influenced by many pressure groups. It was therefore more difficult for Manley as Prime Minister to make certain political decisions. It was much easier for him as a union leader to be more decisive and also to compromise when he was in a tight spot in a negotiation.

It was in the Trade Union that his skills of arbitration and of advocacy were put to their best use.

SIMMS: Over and above Manley's effectiveness in the trade union, what do you see as his greatest contribution to the Jamaican society?

TRADE UNIONIST: He has contributed so much to the society that it is difficult to say what has been his greatest contribution, however, I think that he has given the working class Jamaican people a new depth, security and direction. He has contributed to the building of a sound trade union movement so that the working class have not only economic development, but social and cultural development as well. I think these are the areas in which he contributed tremendously.

SIMMS: What would you define as an area of major weakness in Manley's leadership?

TRADE UNIONIST: He has the need to please and to satisfy everyone, and one might see this as having the potential for weakness.

SIMMS: How does he rank with the other political leaders?

TRADE UNIONIST: His father was distinct in the political sense. Bustamante was also distinctive politically. Shearer showed initial brilliance in the union movement. Michael Manley's greatest arena of brilliance was in the trade union movement.

Of course, my analysis is not that of a politician. I am speaking strictly as a trade unionist.

POLITICAL SCIENTIST

POLITICAL SCIENTIST: First of all, you have to understand in a sense that Michael Manley comes from the closest thing that can be described as an aristocratic elite in Jamaica, or an educated intelligensia as a strata, in the sense that he had the advantage of coming from the very well educated in the context of the 1930's. To understand what this means now--his father, having been to Oxford, his mother being a person of the arts--a sculptor, and the whole ambiance of his socialization was one which would have made him very familiar with ideas in a kind of liberal democratic tradition-the dominant idea system of the period. But more than that, Manley, during his "growing up" period, would have been intimately involved with the issues of power and management of a state, etc.

If there is a political class in Jamaica, then Michael Manley is one of the earliest beneficiaries of the emergence of this political class in the context of Jamaica, and to that extent, I think that he is unique in political terms from any other practicing politician in Jamaica at this point in time. No one else has had the benefit of that kind of education and upbringing--the second generation university trained politician. Most of the others are first generation in that sense. Also there are very few people who have had that intimate connection with the seat of power for as long a time as Michael Manley. The others are first generation politicians. If their fathers were active politically, they would have been active at a lower level of the operation--for instance, someone like Broderick of the JLP, whose father was a Member of Parliament but who would never have had that close connection with the governor and the colonial authorities, nor would he have had the entré which came from being an Oxford graduate like Michael

Manley's father. I think that this sets Michael Manley apart in one sense and this is an objective kind of situation which can be demonstrated.

I suppose what that has meant is that he has been able to gain access to, and admission for, even radical concepts within the body politic in a way that no one else would have been able to. Despite the kind of political hostilities which subsequently developed around the name of Michael Manley, in a sense, because of who he is he has always been able to have access to the most powerful elements in Jamaican society. I think this is significant if you are to understand the strange mix-someone coming from such a conservative setting being known as such a radical.

I suppose along with his early upbringing must be seen his later experiences in the Royal Canadian Air Force and at the London School of Economics. He would have been in London in a period with many of the other leading figures in the society now and in the Third World. This was a period in which the ferment of Third World decolonization and Afro-Asian-Caribbean decolonization was most actively and sharply expressed in ideas and actions. There are a number of personalities and significant conferences that helped to shape the politics of the Third World. These all happened in Britain at that time. I have no idea what Manley's connections were with these events and personalities but what is certain is that he could not have avoided being influenced by the ideas of the period. So one has to understand him in a sense as a "child of the Third World" even though the expression did not come into vogue until the 60's or 70's. He undoubtedly formed his political ideas in the crucible of the decolonization of the Afro-Asian-Caribbean complex. Men like Nehru, Kenyatta as well as his own father were the men that were striding the world stages during his youth. His development was therefore a part of that movement and he, like his father, gave up an equally comfortable social ambiance to join in the political hustings. In this sense Michael Manley has replicated his father but within a different ideological coordinate, but he does represent someone who has repudiated in one sense the comfort of his own origins to challenge and to strike out a new path. In part one can view the foundations of his progressivism as commitment to the ideas and notions of equality and egalitarianism as being laid in the late forties and early fifties. I think that through this process his ideas of the seventies cannot be seen as a sharp change, but as a continuation of ideas. He is indeed the son of Norman Manley and could have been a journalist or a lawyer or an academic like his brother, but instead he chose to be involved in trade unionism and demonstrated his ability to straddle two worlds--the world of an activist politician and the world of the intellectual. In him both were unified very well.

What brought him out in the seventies and allowed the real Michael Manley to emerge (though this phrase might be taking some kind of liberty) would have been the fact that, during the late sixties and the early seventies, it was quite clear that the Caribbean was entering a period of crisis--a period in which it was evident that the established ideas and the established foundations of politics in Jamaica were not going to withstand the challenges of a complex society. It was fortuitous that Michael Manley emerged as the head of his party at this time because he was able then to move on to some intellectually exciting paths. However, his role was more than this, because the political movement of the seventies was more than just Manley's ideas. What was happening was a spontaneous and wide ranging regional ferment. Cuba in 1959, and the Dominican Republic in 1965 along with the mounting economic crisis and the failure of the developmental strategies all created a certain degree of dislocation in the whole Caribbean region.

Jamaica, as part of the region, was confronted with some fundamental economic problems at the same time that it had to recognize a growing radical black nationalist socio-political climate. Along with this growing black nationalism was the growth of the Rastafarian cult and the trade union movement, and the resurgence of a Marxist (Communist) ideology amongst the Left. All these forces were part and parcel of the ferment which heralded the seventies, and Michael Manley had to handle this situation. He therefore struck out on a path that not only represented his view of history but was also a politically conditioned response to the emergence of all these new political tendencies. It was also a response to the recognition of the fact that something new had to be tried if the country was not to collapse under the weight of the inadequacies of the old strategies. Even this striking out on a new path involved the fusion of two kinds of tendencies within Manley--the person interested in change and the social ferment generated by the inadequacies of policies. In a sense then, the contradictions that emerged in the PNP experience or the popularly labelled "Manley experiment" of the seventies would have been reflected because of these two kinds of fundamental sources of initiative. Michael Manley had to do things in the seventies. His political control would have involved two lines of contradictory dispositions. On the one hand, it was necessary as leader for him to impose his stamp on a movement, because he was not like a Nyerere or a Castro who founded their movements; instead he inherited a movement from his father--a movement formed before him and one that had some well established dispositions, and represented a number of competing tendencies. The logic of maintaining a multi-class organization such as the PNP was, involved a kind of politics of conciliation--a kind of balancing of different forces and tendencies. This was unavoidable if Manley was to retain his position of leader of the PNP. At the same time, on the other side of the scale, the social requirements and perhaps his own predispositions required that the stamp of his own ideas needed to be imprinted and that he needed to move the country in a sharply new direction. I therefore see the so-called conflict between radicalism and moderation in the party and in the person in part (a major part) the response to the historical and structural processes that were at work in the society.

Maybe Michael Manley did not succeed in striking the balance between the competing forces, but nonetheless his was not an easy task--history moved at its own pace while his ideas predisposed him to a certain kind of change. My inclination would be to highlight (in view of your concern with his personality) some of these non-personality social-structural-historical elements which have become implicated and embedded in the Manley personality-dynamic of the seventies. His failures were more than indecisiveness--they were more the results of trying to deal with two dissonant roles--the leader of a multi-class moderate and conservative party in a situation in which there are not only emerging radical tendencies but a crisis of policies of development. How does one then strike out on the new paths of social transformation and reorganization and maintain the leadership of this multi-headed force?

SIMMS: What then distinguishes Michael Manley from the rest of the Jamaican political leaders?

POLITICAL SCIENTIST: Well, if we look at the earlier generations of political leaders--Alexander Bustamante and Norman Manley, it is clear that they operated in a period where the elitist view of politics was much more well established and accepted. To some extent, the image of Bustamante as one who would say, "I am the leader, I will tell you how to vote and who to vote for" is an image that no leader (even a reincarnated Bustamante) can project in Jamaica today. Michael Manley therefore cannot be as personalist in his approach as Bustamante was, even though he has managed to attain levels of popularity which rivals those attained by Bustamante. Manley has been much more popular than his father was in that early period because he has been able to retain his father's intellectual commitment (a familiarity with ideas and a willingness to articulate the political themes of the Jamaican body politic) while he deals wih notions of democracy, the Third World decolonization and transformation. These were the call words that were not as forceful in the late fifties and early sixties as they were in the seventies. What sets him apart is that no one else in the JLP or in the PNP has that kind of international reach or the kind of tradition of power that Michael Manley absorbed from the cradle. No one else has been able to wear the mantle of power as easily or as comfortably as he has been able to. He is the kind of person who had many attributes just by being "a Manley". As such, his meaning resonated beyond the boundaries of Jamaica.

As a kind of contrast one needs to look at Seaga, the present Prime Minister (JLP) who had a similar kind of formal intellectual exposure and was a practicing academic--a scholar of sorts--and someone who has tried to link some of the local political discourses and, by virtue of becoming Prime Minister, demonstrate an ability to lead; yet someone who has never been able to project the style, the charisma and the presence, in Jamaica or abroad, of a Michael Manley. In other words, "a Seaga" can never be "a Manley" in the socio-political and psychological bedrock of the Jamaican society. What Seaga represents is another level of political reality and a recognition of a changing "meaning set". We are really seeing in this change of leadership type a kind of convergence and a certain degree of political maturity in a sense.

In terms of Michael Manley's contribution, we have to remember the massive strides made in education over the period, and the growing internationalization of local politics--all of which means that we will never return to the kind of personalistic approaches of the old period (the Bustamante/Manley period). Those days are gone. However, we also have to note the violence that emerged, and perhaps see this as an attempt at coercion rather than as an ideological/cultural coercion which was a feature of personalistic politics. Violence is the modern lever of intimidation as a distinct from the obscurantist/personality politics of the earlier period. This is not to say that we have outgrown all aspects of the latter, but I think that people are now paying much more attention to policies of parties, to dispositions, to international issues and the strategies used to deal with these. Today we are dealing with a highly politicized population, of which eighty-five percent vote and participate--thus any party can have a landslide in one election and be ousted after five years in office. Therefore, Michael Manley represents a kind of unique political figure in that he combines a flamboyant personality with a serious intellectual disposition in order to deal with the realities of his society--a society which has to deal with issues that were unknown in the time of his father. Ideological and conceptual/intellectual aspects of politics decision-making are figuring much more centrally. There is a long term transformation that is taking place and this is seen in the fluidity of political discource and debates.

SIMMS: Is Manley's effort at straddling the classes a weakness or a strength? Is he committed to any one class?

POLITICAL SCIENTIST: Motivations are very complex, but I think that there are certain real objective contradictions which might lead people to see him as "waffling" on certain kinds of issues. However, politics is said to be 'the art of the possible' and oftentimes a leader might want to do certain things but these are not possible in the context of a liberal, democratic framework or even in the context of a certain kind of political balance in a country--irrespective of the kind of form that the political system takes. One has to respond to the social constraints. I think that Michael Manley insofar as he represents the second generation of a nationalist tradition, has a very strong commitment to Jamaican nationalism and to the notion of the democratizatin of Jamaican life. This latter he sees as the only thing that will give life to the concept of nation as something other than just an appendage of a larger metropolitan system. In this respect, I see real commitment. Having been exposed to the kind of intellectual environment in which democracy was held as a sacred value, he internalized a certain value system. This is carried over to the running of the PNP and the conduct of meetings and conferences. On such occasions, one gets a sense of real grassroots democracy at work. Everyone, irrespective of his station in life, knows that he has a right and he exercises that right in the party's forums. The most humble party member can feel free in challenging anyone on issues of party policy. This is not to say that there are not weaknesses in the PNP structure, but I think that there is a genuine commitment to the notion of democracy. There is also a commitment to the notion of Third World liberation and to anti-imperialism (even though this term has come to acquire all kinds of vacuous meanings).

One might be tempted to ask whether or not Manley is genuine, but the question will always arise--"How does one define genuine?" Genuine to one on the far left has a different interpretation than to one on the democratic left, or to a right-winger. In coming to grips with Michael Manley's shortcomings, one must recognize that he has never been the kind of manager of a productive organization. His skills have always been in terms of popular mobilization and his facility with ideas--both vital aspects of politics. Another dimension of the political is the nitty-gritty administrational things that have to be done. This might be mundane, but in government they become crucial. This was the cause of tension in his style and rule, because it is difficult to strike an easy balance between the two sets of skills, especially in a country which does not have a long tradition of democracy as a real and active system.

SIMMS: What adjectives would you use to describe Michael Manley as a leader and as a person?

POLITICAL SCIENTIST: I would say hardworking, democratic, flamboyant, are descriptions of the kind of person he is. His leadership was a transformation process. The negative side of the question could point to problems of indecisiveness in the resolution of problems, but then we must remember that the politics of transformation is even younger than our democracy. In fact, our democracy emerged out of a desire to transform. The politics of transformation had, so to speak, taken on new life since the late sixties and into the seventies. In this sense, we are a very young nation and the political forces behind changes are still not fully developed. The turbulence in Grenada can, on one level, be analysed as an example of this kind of immaturity of the new wave politics in the region.

I suspect that the PNP as a whole, and Michael Manley as a person, would have learned a lot from their experiences in the seventies.

SIMMS: How will history record Michael Manley's eight years as Prime Minister (1972-1980)?

POLITICAL SCIENTIST: I would say that he has hepled to consolidate the democratic impulse of Jamaican political life. I think that even today, one can listen to public opinion on the popular radio programs and realize that everyone, irrespective of class and/or abilities, gives the impression that he has the right to comment on any social or political matter. One senses that the people feel that they have a right to demand attention from those in power. As such then, this is Michael Manley's legacy. The high level of politicization and mobilization that has surrounded his political life is noteworthy. He has also given a sense of dignity to the black people of Jamaica--a sense of dignity that, even in the face of resurging conservatism, cannot be erased. Of course, this is the outcome of a longer process than that of Michael Manley's administration, but I think that his administration helped to consolidate the process and rooted it in the society in very real and practical ways--the rights of participation (the worker participation programs), political activism in unions, and consumer organizations and political parties and the whole wide ranging sense of civic mindedness that is now present in the community. It was Michael Manley's good fortune to have been the person at the helm when the society was able to give expression to such a process, and to help unleash the quest for a new form. This, I think is his place in our history.

YOUTH LEADER

YOUTH LEADER: He has a magical quality (more than charisma), a way of mobilizing and motivating people (old people, young people, farmers, the unemployed). His popularity was typified by the mythical overtones of Joshua and the rod. He captured a mood. I don't think this was accidental. I think he knew when the political mood was right. He had the ability to read and assess political moods of the country and he planned change according to what he perceives. That is not to say that he has always been correct, but I think more times than not he has acted correctly.

Apart from this, he has been associated with issues which have made him very popular. For instance, his concern with the poor sufferer. In this, some people feel he is not genuine, some feel that he is. In addition, he also identified with issues around the African struggle, the Workers' struggle--popular real issues.

Among the youth, Manley has had great popularity as our leader. The Hon. Hugh Shearer never had such popularity during his term as Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister, Seaga, has never had such popularity. Somehow, among the young people (not just PNP young people, but young people in general), Michael Manley has been very popular. He has also been popular amongst the women's groups. Perhaps it could be argued this can be attributed to his good looks, etc., etc., but one has to realize that his politics have been very strong and he does not just engage in simple rhetoric, but he translates this into social programs and instigated legislation that affected women, e.g., The Bastardy Act.

The programs of the 1970's were railroaded by the IMF at a time when Manley demonstrated the height of his rhetoric. This is when he spoke about support for Cuba and other controversial issues, and initially people saw this in a positive light because the Cubans were building schools in the island and they were assisting the Angolans. Later on, there was growing anti-Cuban sentiment fostered by opposing elements in the society. However, the single most important factor that caused a decline in Michael Manley's popularity was the poor economy. The shortage of supplies, unemployment, the scarcity of money, the increasing sabotage by the private sector and business class all created problems. These were not helped by the public perception of Manley's vacillation on some of these issues. The people outside of the party do not understand as well the internal workings of the PNP. Sometimes they do not realize that even those who disagree with him violently are not necessarily opposed to him as a leader.

As youths, we realized that we were opposed to issues but not to the leadership of the party. Because Manley is undoubtedly the best person to lead the party at this point in time, despite the opposition to some of his policies, no one is at the point when they would like to replace him as the leader of the party. Many people outside of the formal structure of the party are of the opinion that persons who speak out on issues are against Manley and this has created problems for some very good workers and party members.

At times, on certain issues, one has to wonder why Michael Manley is so indecisive. For instance, on the issue of Member of Parliaments' performances--there were known cases of persons who did no work and in many of these, neither the leader nor the party took a strong position. They would merely go through the motions of mentioning recall and other disciplinary measures, but invariably they did nothing about these cases. We therefore had government ministers who were not performing.

Manley himself worked very hard--there is no doubt about that. Was it because they were loyalists why they retained their positions? He did not need personal sycophants because his position was not being challenged in the party. In other words, it was not a matter of another contending leader forcing him to seek loyalists. Such areas of indecision were areas of weakness.

Another issue is that the party as a party never really understood or paid attention to questions such as the economy, and, in terms of leadership, one wonders why Manley allowed his party not to understand economic questions. There was no serious educational program, so it was difficult to know those who were committed to progress. My question is, "Why didn't Manley insist that the party carry out a political education program?" In this situation there were many who were confused about the party's principles, objectives and programs. Many PNP people felt that the party was becoming a communist party because of their lack of understanding of why things were done.

On the other side, Michael Manley had a commitment to bourgeois democracy--this is not a weakness, it is a reality of the society. Manley was therefore always conscious of the feelings of groups such as the churches and other minority interest groups. He listened to what they had to say and, in many cases, he paid too much attention to them. Additionally, he had a strong commitment to press freedom which some people saw as a weakness. They expected him to stand decisively on those issues. I think that the one issue on which he was definitely weak had to do with the state sector. In this sector, there were people who were sabotaging the party and the government, but I don't think that the government took any fundamental steps on this. This area was definitely a weakness. One cannot understand how a government could knowingly allow people to sabotage it. In 1976 there were also elements in the Army and in the Police who were involved in political activities. There were ample grounds on which to apprehend these persons, yet the government under Manley never acted because they didn't want to build up further hostility. Questions around these decisions are still bothersome. One wonders if Manley did not have time to pay attention to such issues, or if he deliberately refused to attend to them. In such a climate, the party machinery broke down. The removal of the then General Secretary caused a rift and many things that the party should be alerted about were obscured or covered up. Everyone in the top echelons of the Party was by then in the Government and as such they were out of touch with the rank and file leadership of the party who were also out of touch with the wide masses of the people. The weaknesses that were identified then, in hindsight, can be more well enunciated as

1) weakness within the state sector

2) weakness within the civil service and statutory organizations because of the people who were hostile to the government's programs, and who opposed the programs by not working--thus they sabotoged them.

SIMMS: Was Mr. Manley protecting his class interest by not taking action in these areas?

YOUTH LEADER: I agree that Mr. Manley has not broken with his class interest, but on these issues I don't think class considerations were important. I can remember when he expelled the American Ambassador because he felt a personal threat. In these other cases, he thought that he could survive and he did not want to build up any more opposition from the people. He also believed that President Carter was a more democratic person than his predecessor, Ford. With Carter and Andrew Young, Manley was counting on the United States not to destabilize. They were part of his plan to survive.

I am not saying his perceptions and subsequent decisions were right or wrong, but once he got involved in the IMF debate and had to adhere to the political conditions of this institution, then he had to scrap many of his programs and shy away from a truly socialist stance. After 1977, he noticeably stopped criticizing U.S. imperialism and generally softened his posture. Nevertheless, he still maintained popularity, particulary amongst the PNP youth. At the same time, many of his Members of Parliament could no longer connect with the people, they did not know what to tell the people. Only Michael Manley could still reach out to the masses--even if this was purely by rhetoric at this stage. He could still motivate the people but the middle leadership could not. Most of these did not have the power of rhetoric or the leader image to fall back on.

Inside the party, Manley allowed the right wing forces to have too much influence on him and he became suspicious of the Left, who were his natural allies and to whom he was closer ideologically. Perhaps he thought that elements of the Left wanted to move much further left (there is some truth here) but at no time did the entire Left want any adventurist path. I think they wanted to get rid of certain people within the party--the people who were definitely opposed to Socialism. Since the defeat of the PNP these are the people who helped to discredit the party and many of them fled and left the party when the chips were down. I am sure that at one time Michael Manley could not conceive of a party or a Cabinet without some of these people--many of whom were in the party before him. Eventually these people left and the party still survived.

Michael's strength (sometimes defined as a weakness by some) lies in the fact that he has been able to unite all the tendencies in the party around his leadership. Some people say that he plays this role in order to remain the leader, since he is the only one that can have the spport of both the Left and the Right. Those who see this as a weakness argue that he is always trying to balance and compromise the Left and the Right so that he can find a middle position. At times I see this style of leadership as a strength, but at other times I see it as a serious weakness. Manley sometimes compromises because he cannot afford to alienate any one side, especially the Right. One wonders why he is so insistent on having an identified Right wing within the party. Some people see this as maintaining his class ties by not alienating his middle class supporters, etc., etc. I don't know if it is really a weakness or a strength, but I do know that it is a style of his leadership.

SIMMS: Does the Jamaican political climate foster his style of leadership?

YOUTH LEADER: The question is whether he will always be a product of the climate. In 1974 he was the one who declared that the party should follow a socialist path. Many young persons like myself see this as an important first step, and committed ourselves to work with it and develop an understanding of what democratic socialism really is. Many of us thought this title was a stupid one. We realize that Socialism is inherently democratic, however we understood that many might interpret it as a dictorial process--thus it needed within the Jamaican context to be prefixed by Democratic. To many of the people in leadership positions, Democratic Socialism was just a slogan. Many of them had no understanding of its meaning. Many of them thought that be declaring Democratic Socialism as the policy of the government that Jamaica had instantly become a socialist country. Such an understanding was so superficial that it became distorted into an anti-rich ideology amongst a large number of people.

SIMMS: What then is the future? If the PNP ally with the Right, it becomes like the JLP, and if it continues on its usual path then it has very little more to offer. What is the party's alternative path?

YOUTH LEADER: Our problems have nothing to do with the program of the party. The program is relevant and progressive in the context of Jamaican society. The problem of the party has to do with the lack of commitment to that program. This program advocates a mixed economy with a dominant state sector. I think that the challenge is to unite all the classes around this program. I have no problem with this as long as it is understood that the class that must lead within the party is the working class. This is where the problem comes. The party has never really been a working class led party. It has always had a petit-bourgeois leadership--the conservative professionals who always dominate the leadership of the PNP. Even those who are of working class background have a petit-bourgeios outlook. The PNP programs are good but we need more politically conscious people in the leadership ranks.

SIMMS: Is there hope for the future?

YOUTH LEADER: I don't know. There are still struggles within the party.

B. OPPONENTS OF THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY

MINISTER OF GOVERNMENT (JLP)

GOVT. MINISTER: First of all, Mr. Manley's relationship with the business community in Jamaica is mutlifaceted and of very long standing.

When he returned to Jamaica in 1951 or 1952, he was a journalist and therefore he had to meet business people and deal with them. He became an organizer for the National Workers' Union and in that respect he had to argue with employers across the country.

I would venture to say that he did not come across as an anti-employer individual, and he had a very moderate image, indeed, the claim is that he was brought into the union to affect the party by getting rid of the Leftist elements which at the time were infiltrating particularly the bauxite union. This was in the mid 1950's. He married however, a Verity who was the daughter of the manager of the Sugar Manufacturers' Association, at a time when this association was the largest, most powerful and most vigorous opponent of the union movement. This goes to show Mr. Manley's multifaceted character. In other words, he, up to the time that he took office, was very much a middle-class, what is called 'high brown' or even 'white' Jamaican with upper class habits, upper class behaviour patterns and upper class friends and associates. In that period he always drove very large cars, the very latest model, and wore very stylishly cut clothes. He was always a person who had a large number of friends around him--of whatever type. These friends were usually people who were very mod and up-to-date and with the latest trends.

After he gained office in 1972, there was, of course, a tremendous transformation in his relationship with the business sector. He gained office with the tremendous support of a group of young business people who were very wealthy and who supported him in every possible way. They supported him financially, to the point, where, I am told, one of them kept his cheque book and made certain that he had whatever he wanted, whenever he wanted money. They supported him administratively in terms of arranging his schedules, of planning for him, setting up offices for him and making his constituency arrangements. They also, more importantly, provided a psychological support for him in that they were always at his beck and call and they were always able to discuss things with him. He could always lean on them if he had a problem, and he was very much at home with them.

This group of businessmen were, at the time, in their mid-thirties to mid-forties, they were largely white or almost white, most of them had inherited wealth, though some of them had made their own money. They were jet set people and among them were many women with whom Manley's name was associated at this time, with the single exception of his present wife, who at the time was a girl friend.

After winning power, he changed radically. There are many points of view about this change. There is a point of view which says that the people who had supported him into power and who had given him the impression that they had all the answers to Jamaica's problems, when confronted with the realities, were unable to give the kind of support that he needed and therefore he had to turn to other people who were the leftists, and who seemed to offer him much more acceptable solutions. I don't myself buy that theory because he is a grown man and if you take power you must certainly have your own ideas and have an assessment of what is possible and what is not possible. I can't really buy that anyone could be so shallow as to have really expected that a group of jet set guys who are helping you and who, in fact, expect you to have the answers, that he could expect them to have the answers, but that is part of the paradox of Mr. Manley's personality.

He became a captive of the Left and became a friend of Fidel Castro, an associate of Maurice Bishop and got the PNP active once again in the Socialist International. He has risen to become a Vice President in this organization. There was a radio interview with him by Tony Verity which was published by Jamaica Information Service in 1972 and it is an interview in which he gives his opinions and Verity asked him what was his view of Socialism and whether this had any attraction to him in terms of solving Jamaica's problems. His answer was unequivocal. He said, "I don't believe there is any country in the world that is truly capitalist or truly socialist, and I believe that the labels are meaningless and people who are seeking to find their solutions through looking at labels are really wasting their time. You have to look at reality". This was the view that he had in early 1972, two months after being in office, and I do believe that was his view then. I certainly believe that it not his view now. Though there are apologists who believe that he is not a socialist but that he went this heavy socialist route because he needed to take the minds of the people off the reality and to give them something to hold on to, and that the slogans and the sort of revolutionary paraphernalia of socialism can keep the masses in place and give them something to be satisfied with when you can't in fact do so yourself in terms of the capacity of the government. In other words, he is just going through a charade, but he doesn't believe all the type of revolutionary and theoretical rhetoric which he spouts. I don't know whether this is so or not! What I do know is that the rhetoric that he used during the period he was in office, was tremendously damaging to Jamaica and in particular to the business sector, and that he was advised certainly by me and by other leaders of the private sector, of the dangers which his rhetoric, his stance, his philsophy and his policies were causing to the private sector and to the country--and he pressed on regardless. I am advised that during this period, he would have businessmen, from time to time, call him and he would notify them and tell them, "Don't believe everything you hear, things will work out alright", but he never did resolve the conflicts and implement the kind of policies or bring about that kind of confidence which was required in the economy or in himself as an individual. This would have saved the Jamaican people so much suffering.

There are people who say that the answer to people like Mr. Manley's character is to be found in his relationship with women; his relationship with his mother which is very deep and very close and very interesting; and his relationship with his father. It is said that he had a very strong Oedipus Complex and it is claimed that from time to time he has taken physical violence to both his father and his mother. I have no means of verifying (nor have I sought to) those assertions, but I merely say it in the context that these are used by people as a means of attempting to analyse his character. He has, however, said on several occasions that he would never become a lawyer, in fact he didn't want to become a politician because he has always said he wanted to "make life on his own" which suggests an oedipal statement--suggesting that there is a reaction to the very strong, the very successful father. On the other hand, he has a tremendous love, reverence and respect for his father and his father's memory. I heard him speak at a political meeting the night that his father died. He was speaking in support of the person who was running in his father's seat, Ken McNeil, and he spoke for about an hour and never mentioned McNeil's name once. He kept on and on about his father, and I think he almost completely forgot the purpose of why he was speaking. He was speaking as if he was giving a eulogy for his father. This was quite strange because nobody else at the meeting was aware of the fact that the old man Manley, was at that time dying.

His relationship with his women is also interesting. He has had a very large number--a very long string of them--and his treatment of them has been the subject of long columns in divorce papers: violence, maltreatment, lack of care and protection and so on. Many people have felt that this is a part of the sort of character that he has. He is a person who really is extremely selfish, that he does not care about anyone except his own pleasure and that he is a hedonist to the nth degree. He will use whoever he can from time to time and will discard whoever it is without a moment's notice or without even thinking or caring.

His relationship with his children, on the other hand, has been, if anything, exemplary. It is said that he cares very much for his children, that he loves them very dearly, will do anything for them. This again is paradoxical; his relationship with his children is certainly quite different from his relationship with their mothers, or whomever else.

As a character, he is a very charming person, he is very handsome and attractive and he works this for all it is worth. He has always been a "pet" of the society and he behaves as if he is entitled to it. His relationship with his prefects at Jamaica College from which he was requested to leave because he called a strike against the headmaster, is a very interesting episode and a key to his character. In his book, The Politics of Change, he deals with it, with his problems at Jamaica College and quite strangely justifies his behaviour and is still criticizing forty years later the prefects at his school. Many might say that one would have expected him to have understood that prefects and masters have a role in maintaining discipline in the school society and that whatever might have been his instincts or his glorious nobility in wanting to help little boys against big boys or students against teachers or whatever, all of this is a part of life in which one has to learn that there is such a thing as order and discipline and that there are rules and that the rules are going to be made by someone and obeyed by others. The fact that, even in 1972, he was still defensive of the position that he had held as a "rude boy" at school is, in my view, a key to his character. It might be interesting for you to know that he regards as one of his big achievements the democratization of schools, which is by law stating that the students must be on the school boards and also stating that they must have a particpatory say in the running of the schools. There are educators in Jamaica who trace a good deal of the indiscipline and the breakdown of our schools to statements that he made, and to the attitudes that he engendered at that point in time. It is also a fact that most of these students do not, in fact, attend the school board meetings, and that their participation has been regarded by them rather more as a token rather than a creating any sort of real dialogue. The experience has been that if the students have a problem, the board has to meet and discuss this with them as students and principal. Therefore, having one member on the board which normally discusses mostly the finances of the school and matters to do with staffing and policies of the development of the institution, is not of any importance to the students, to the extent that they do not have the ability or experience to take part in the decision-making which has to be done. Yet Mr. Manley regards this as one of his great achievements and as far as I am aware, he has never taken account of the tremendous damage which was done to the system and to the entire society, by giving out a youth versus the rest of society, a student versus teacher, a small boy versus perfect dialogue, to the entire development within the school system. Those are some of the aspects.

In terms of his negotiating and bargaining as a Trade Unionist, I have never heard him accused of acting in bad faith or of not keeping his word. I have not heard that, so since I haven't heard it, I presume it must be the case that he has kept his word and that as a unionist he attempted to deliver whatever he said he would. The National Workers' Union has always supported him fully and the only blot on his term in Trade Unionism was the claim made publicly and in the Daily Gleaner by the then attorney for the union, Hugh Small, who claimed that he had stolen ten thousand pounds from the union. This was stated in two letters to the Daily Gleaner by Mr. Small, who subsequently had to resign from the union and the amount of money was subsequently said to have been a loan to Mr. Manley.

It was very embarrasing and it says something for his very high reputation, and also for the tolerance of the society, that this has never been held against him in terms of his operation in public life, but then again, I might say that the Jamaican society does not hold financial pecadillos against any politicians. This has never been used effectively against any politician of which I am aware--pecadillos on that level. If you are guilty of very small misdemeanors at the local level, I suppose, like stealing people's oranges or being accused as a goat thief, you probably wouldn't be used as a branch secretary, but in terms of being a member of Parliament or a minister, the society is very tolerant of whether you are officially charged.

In recent months, Manley's latest development as a lecturer on the international circuit has given a brand new scope to his character and one is extremely surprised that at this time of his life, he is literally chasing money, to the exclusion of those interests which he has pursued all his life. His appointment of an agent in the U.S.A. to go around to get lectures for him, strictly on the basis of financial rewards, is, of course, an American custom. To my knowledge, he is certainly the first West Indian politician to have adopted that route; and certainly he is also the first West Indian politician to have held office and, being as anti-American as he was, and then also to now work in the U.S.A. for a good part of the year. This seriously makes one question the sincerity of the man, because as leader of the opposition and a senior advisor to the National Workers' Union as well as the President of his party (which is beyond any doubt in a very serious position with respect to very low levels of representation at both parliamentary and parish council levels) one would have expected him to be using his time and his efforts towards holding the party together and building it up rather than speaking to groups in the U.S.A., most of whom have no power or importance at all--little known colleges and talk shops all over the place. But he is doing it for money and one doesn't understand what it is he is telling people, because obviously one wonders if he doesn't in fact, from time to time, compromise his position, given that he has to speak to Americans and Americans are, after all, Americans. The very stridently anti-American position which he has in international forums and which he has here obviously could not be his position, and is not in fact hs position, when he speaks particularly to rural townships and Kiwanis clubs which form the bulk of his audiences these days. One might say in doing this he is simply being a very modern politician, a very modern human being because this certainly is a part of the American way of life in the twentieth century. But there again, being a socialist, a representative of the Third World and so on and so forth, a Vice-President of the Socialist International, one would have wondered whether the sort of most recent American fads were what one would have expected him to indulge himself in. Of course, he has a three year old child and a twelve year old child as well as a boy in University and so on, so one could say he needs the financial support to carry them through. So do we all, and we don't all work in the U.S.A. So I do't know quite what to make of that.

There again, he is over sixty and he is approaching the end of his career in politics. One might say that he is phasing himself out for younger people to take over and is therefore maximizing his last years of earning power. Anyway--you can assess that.

SIMMS: Do you think that Democratic Socialism, as it was espoused by the PNP and Mr. Manley is totally antagonistic to the business sector, or do you see it as an anti-productive philosophy?

GOVT. MINISTER: Well, Democratic Socialism as he outlines it is definitely anti-productive, not just ani-private sector, but anti-productive. He included with it worker participation, student participation and a number of other ideas which created difficulties in our society. My personal view is that it is anti-productive in a society starved of capital as most Third World countries are, and in a society which is set on a mood where its people are desperately interested in improving their standard of living (and there are some societies that are not, for instance there are Islamic societies, and other traditional societies of the East, where the people don't necessarily want to improve their standard of living, where they are far more interested in their spiritual way of life and in the purity of their beliefs). In the West Indian society and in Jamaica we are extraordinarily materialistic, we are extraordinarily interested in improving our way of life, and the only way that can be done is with acretions of capital. I can't find any reference to Socialism, any type of Socialism at all, as being in the public interest, because it is not the case that people will put money into a Socialist country of whatever type. There are far too many countries into which capitalists have to go, and not just capitalist, but developed countries of whatever type, where they can put their money, and have complete assurance of its safety and its repatriation, for them to put it into a country which espouses Socialism. And I might say that in this there is a great deal of hypocrisy because if you go to a lot of developed countries, particularly in Europe, and spout a socialist line you will get a tremendous response in terms of public acceptability of what you are saying and what you are doing, but they won't put up any money your way, which is basically what you want to help your people.

On the other hand, if you give a capitalist line you tend to be very passe and perhaps might not be paid too much attention. You might be even regarded as a stooge. On the other hand, I am afraid that that is the only line which ends up in getting you the capital which you severely need. As I said, if you don't need capital, if you decide that you are going to live a relatively simple life, with all the sort of rural and rustic virtues of clean water and a nice thatched hut with cows mooing outside--if this is what you decide that you want for your society, then you can call it socialist or whatever you choose to call it. It wouldn't be a problem because you could then be what Mr. Manley calls self-reliant. Unfortunately, our society is not interested in that and never has been. None of our leaders have been, least of all him who is a conspicuous consumer of the very highest order.

SIMMS: In terms of their contribution to the Jamaican political and historical development, what would you say was Mr. Manley's greatest contribution to the Jamaican society? In other words, what is his place in history?

GOVT. MINISTER: I would say that the Manley years were years when we lost our innocence. He changed the society radically. A larger number of people who had slightly racist or even blatantly racist ideas or even ideas of themselves as a class had to come to grips with themselves. He certainly brought this abut in the society and lost us our innocence because it was the first time that most Jamaicans questioned whether they wanted to live in Jamaica. Up to this time, no Jamaican ever questioned this. A number of Jamaicans said they couldn't live here at this time because they needed money, so they would go abroad to earn money to come back. That was 99% of the immigrants. During the Manley period we lost our innocence and a large number of people said, "I don't want to live in Jamaica, you couldn't give me enough money to live here", and they left. We lost our innocence because this question is constantly being asked and what it means now is that our society is far more subjected to changes that come about by people exporting money, which never used to happen before this time, by people who wonder always whether they should make an investment in Jamaica or somewhere else, even though they had never probably been abroad. But by creating us into a situation where we are now seen not as a stable sort of poor, old fashioned country toying with experiments, but rather as a country that could explode, I think he has certainly put us into this and if it were not for Mr. Manley, for instance, and what had happened in the 1970's, there is no way that we, for instance, would have gone and assisted in the invasion of Grenada. We would simply say, "that is not our affair, what they want to do down there is their business", but because of him, when it happened in Grenada everybody said, "My God, it could have happened here" and therefore there was this tremendous feeling that "we must do something", so in that respect he has really lost us our innocence and made us a part of the wider world and subjected us to all sorts of new perceptions and new pressures--both opportunities, I suppose, and setbacks and difficulties which we certainly were not in at all--in our sphere in our thinking--prior to the 29th of February, 1972.

SIMMS: The loss of innocence is not necessarily negative then?

GOVT. MINISTER: I don't know. If you lose your virginity, is it good? Or is it bad?

SIMMS: You yourself said that Michael Manley has qualitatively changed the society to the disadvantage of one set of persons (note your discussion on the reasons for the recent migration). On the other hand he allowed some people to feel better about themselves.

GOVT. MINISTER: I only know that theoretically you could substantiate your argument and indeed, for a time in the seventies, we did see some gains, but the polls which were taken around that question found that after an eight year, eight months period there was no group within the society [poor urban, poor rural, middle urban or middle rural or upper (urban or rural)] that felt themselves to have been improved by his administration and indeed none was, as was very very plain if you looked at the society. But it was definitely a loss of innocence.

SIMMS: Class issues have always been raised, but some people have suggested that race has become a much more dynamic concept and this came to the forefront in very stark ways during the Manley regime. How would you respond to this statement?

GOVT. MINISTER: The problem was that we were getting a backlash of the Black Power Movement in the early seventies and the hippy movement in the U.S.A. which led to tremendous growth of Rastafariansism which up to this period had been a very minor sect. This suddenly became a very dominant force in the society during Manley's period. The ideas of colour and class and all that, in Jamaica, were very strong. Marcus Garvey started all this back in the twenties so this is nothing new to us in Jamaica. Manley certainly was our first leader who had spoken out very strongly on racial issues in the society. Unfortunately, because he usually mixed it up with capitalist an imperialistic statements, it very often came across that what he was saying was that white people were slave masters and capatalist oppressors and this created a lot of negatives. If he had simply stuck to the racial part of it--stating well "white people, brown people, black people, we 'are all one'" and so on, "you can't oppress people, whatever colour", but he didn't, he would always bring in the fact that you are poor because of the capitalist keeping you poor and because local capitalists are tools of foreign imperialists and these foreigners are coming here to oppress you, and then he would say, "black people must stand up". In other words, he got the whole thing so mixed up that it was coming across as racist, blatantly racist dogma such that people (white and brown Jamaicans of poor means and middle class circumstances or even lower middle class circumstances) who were attracted to what he said, found themselves the butt of attacks by people whom they supported because they didn't see themselves as any different. I might say that the Chinese community suffered more than any other single community. They are generally a capitalistic community and they migrated to a very large extent. A very heavy loss of Chinese came about and they are very bitter because within a hundred years they had transformed themselves from being very poor peasants into wealthy people and they were generally quite nationalistic. They saw themselves as Jamaicans and there was no issue. They suddenly realized that there was an issue and we lost hundreds of millions of dollars in that respect as well as creating a whole class of people who are very bitter. Most of them lived in their little shops out in the country and they were subjected to abuse and they felt very badly used. The fact that they have gone away to a society that doesn't use them any better doesn't help their particular case. They can't go back to China. They have a problem.

SIMMS: Some people say Mr. Manley manipulates symbols. Do you see the Rastafarian cult as part of this? How is Mr. Manley's use of the Rastafarians different from Mr. Seaga's use of Revivalism?

GOVT. MINISTER: Well, in the first place, my personal view is that the Jamaican individual has always been a very dignified and self-assured person, and I have a very serious difference with Mr. Manley on this. He feels that our people were cowed and were completely suppressed and that it took him to give us our national dignity and our capacity to resist and to stand up for ourselves. I completely disagree with this. I come from a rural background in the country and I have always felt our people to be aggressive, assertive and very careful of their rights on little things like whether one can go to use a pond across another's property or whether some people's cattle can come into your place. What is your right of line and all that sort of thing? I never found our people to be not careful. In fact they went to the opposite extent. They are always pushing their fence against someone else's property if the person is bigger than them. So I completely disagree with Mr. Manley who felt somehow that people in the society were not aware of their rights. I have grown up always hearing people talk about somebody taking away their rights. I have found our people to have a very strong sense of their worth and their dignity, which particularly comes out if you go to the U.S.A. and compare us with other black people. So, as far as I am concerned, his thing about Rastafarian and so on and so forth, is purely cosmetic and is, purely political. Prior to 1972 he never showed any interest. Manley is a man like myself who listens to classical music, and he reads the latest books out of London. His interest in anything African or in any sort of local culture would be long after he was aged fifty and really completely out of character. He had no interest in such matters.

Mr. Seaga, on the other hand, is a sociologist and studied Revivalism. He is intellectually interested in that sort of thing--for whatever reason he is interested. That is his interest. He has written a book on cults in Jamaica and he is certainly the first man, of whom I am aware, to have taken any interest in folk cultures, in folk cults in Jamaica, and I myself (if I say so myself) am quite knowledgeable but had no idea of the range of folk and the different ideas and patterns that were there. Not only me, nobody else knew until he went and did his research. I must say that it is intellectually very interesting so I can understand why, as a sociologist, he is interested in it and if you wish to know, since 1980 there has been a tremendous growth of particularly the Zion churches and the Revivalist Movement throughout the country. This is because those people, irrespective of what anybody else might think, are of a view that Mr. Seaga, the Prime Minister, is pushing their brand of religion, and they are certainly very happy and expanding it as fast as they can in the ghetto areas. If you go there, the number of churches is absolutely amazing. You would be absolutely surprised at the number that are there and they are expanding every day.

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT:JLP

MP (JLP): Michael Manley is not a leader. Like many other people he had leadership thrust on him. There are leaders who are born and there are leaders who have achieved a greatness which is demonstrated in their ability to lead. Intellectually, they have achieved it.

You have to understand Manley as one of those Jamaicans who has a background of fortune; his father was probably about 75% Irish, his mother is English. In the Jamaican context he is a "privileged boy", born in a high class family and a high class home. His father possessed a certain quantum of greatness because he was an intellectual, an athlete and a brilliant lawyer. Michael, as far as I am personally concerned, thrived on the fact that out of that home--his mother, one of the best artists in the Caribbean, a brilliant woman--he naturally would achieve certain privileges and standards based on the fact that he was "way up top" by his father being there. Now, give it to him--to be honest--he is one of the brighter chaps in the country. He received a very good education, he has a beautiful vocabulary and he has developed "style"--real style. He is a very charismatic chap and his charm comes from the fact again of what Jamaicans think.

Now, Manley has an ego which, in my opinion, is a reverse type of thing: he had luxury, but his ego needs to demonstrate that he does not. He would give his wealth away. Because of this, he is extremely attractive at the grassroots level. He is the type of guy who would drive an old car, although people expect him to be in a "swanky car". He is the type of chap who will sleep among the menials, although people look at him and say, "boy, that is Mr. Manley' son, Mrs. Manley's child, so he should be way up top". Because of that sort of what you would call, humble ego he attracts a mass of people to him and it is good political strategy, it is good political charisma, but I would not record him as a Bustamante who had the dynamic of leadership created in him, being able to direct people--regardless. But, as I said, if you look at the fact that Shearer was able to inherit Bustamante, Manley was able to inherit his father--it is a natural thing--and if I stay in politics long enough and I have a child that comes up and has the flair for it--can adopt the flair for it--he will naturally follow in the situation.

Manley should not have led the PNP, because there were men in the PNP who were much much more capable in terms of experience and in terms of dynamism in leadership, but they were not as charismatic as Manley. In other words, they could not get the youth and the masses to clap for them and jeer for them as Manley could, so he won out and became leader of the party. For the ten years that he was there he never was able to demonstrate that type of leadership which comes from being able to take decisions and being able to generate around him people who take the right decisions and give the right type of leadership. What I discovered is that he took snappy, quick and stupid decisions which means that he reacted emotionally rather than constructively, intellectually and otherwise. I don't know if he gets a chance another time around whether he would be a more settled person and a more settled leader.

I am sure that people who psychoanalyse him would recognize that his whole family background did a lot for him in his achievement and also created the indiscipline that he has. He is a man who has divorced two women, one died, and is separated from the other one. That shows the man's inability to manage a home and, in my opinion, shows his inability to manage a country. (I am married now for thirteen years and

I manage my home, and part of that management is to create a stable home and to know when my wife is to be right and when she is to be wrong; whether she is right or wrong. I know how much respect my children are to give, etc., etc.)

I don't think, as I said, that one should really record him having been at the top of leadership at all, but he achieved it through inheritance, and I think there is no way that one could say that he could have achieved it by working for it. He could not have gotten there. The Jamaican system creates a lot of fear because of what people can do. It creates a lot of fear because of your family background, and respect pushes you to a prejudiced position of fear or over-love--overkill, and Manley got that. He is a mother's boy, he runs home, shadows under his mother and I don't know if he gets love at home but he demonstrates a passion of love for his mother. People question, but I don't know (and I would not want this to be a criticism because I don't know) his father's relationship with him. One thing I know, however, is that the passion and emotion which he exhibits mislead him. People would mislead him very easily. For instance, he put me into prison for a whole year, and I am sorry for him because I think he believes in my guilt. I think that the sort of things that people tell him, he passionately believes, and I don't know what his reaction would be if one day he finds out that he was wrong. I don't know if he is big enough to apologize, I don't know if he is big enough to say "I am sorry", I don't know if he is big enough to say "Look, I really thought so". For example, before I was imprisoned, he sent for me and told me that he had heard that I was the person who was in charge of a group of Vietnamese ex-soldiers (black American soldiers) in this country. I said, "You are talking complete nonsense" and he terminated the meeting because of my statement. He thought that my reaction was rude and that was it--he imprisoned me three days later. I would never ever call Manley a leader. I think he got leadership because of inheritance, but he certainly did not demonstrate it.

He had, I would say, the best mobilized, and the best period of people's mobilization in the country in 1972, and in two years he muffed it. He muffed it because it was a different social period from this one and in 1972, people were willing to share and there were things to share. In 1980 we had a good parliamentary swing in lean times and I think that whatever detraction we have in politics today is completely different from when he was there, because he really got a hold of the society when every class was mobilized in 1972, and would have moved forward as one, and he messed it up by using the same charismatic nonsense, by splitting the society, using one set of people against another set of people, by taking sides with the majority simply for political reasons. To show you Michael Manley's approach--he introduced the 'kareba' style of dressing in Jamaica years ago and he has never worn a suit in Jamaica since, yet any time the camera catches him abroad (like two months ago), he was dressed in a suit and tie in London. He goes to New York and he is dressed there, but he never wears a suit and tie in Jamaica. I think he lives a fake life. Personally, I think that Michael Manley has some sort of psychiatric kink and problems. I am not a psychiatrist, not a medical person and I could not make a definite statement to say, "I am not sure", but his whole reaction to problems, his whole reaction to what he doesn't like gives me the impression that if he were psychoanalysed he would be found to have a psychiatric shortcoming, and if one examines most of the things that he has done, and watches the flair with which he does them, and the flap which overcomes him when they fail, then one would recognize that there is an internal force which characterizes more than just a normal flow. I definitely wouldn't write up Manley as a leader. I think he is all built up, he came at the right time, his father gave it to him, the masses were with him when he got it, he flared into it, he created the tensions and won the elections.

Politically, he is not on the right path, but he will do anything. He is a guy who would stoop to anything to reach his goal and then demonstrate. I have a recording of Manley in which he claimed that he would never ever believe in Socialism or any isms for that matter and six months later he declared that he was "born a Democratic Socialist", because it suited him. Now, I would never do that. I tell people the truth. I am a pragmatist. I don't believe in any one ideology, I believe that in all ideologies there are areas in which I can work and I think that in all the ideologies that I have studied, I have seen a certain quantum of ideas that could create a better life for people.

I don't put myself to be a part of any genius line that could put all the good things from all the ideologies together and create a perfect situation, but I think I could find enough to work with, so I don't box myself into "anti-this" or "pro-this", but pragmatically anything that nationally is in the country's interest or in the people's interest I will proceed with.

SIMMS: You raised the point that Michael Manley successfully mobilized the people. Are you saying that the Jamaican people are attracted to him because of his personal qualities? If he is not a leader, should we not focus on the societal problems rather than on him as an individual?

MP(JLP): Yes, let us face the facts. The Jamaican people, because of a whole inheritance of colonialism or slavery, have always had more respect for a brown man than for a black man. This has always been the case. Now, if Seaga, who is not black, but is of Lebanese decent, wanted to exploit the colour question, he would be much more attractive than any black man, because black people in Jamaica have never really rallied around a leader simply because he is black. They rally around you because "you are one of us". If they think that you are "high up there" and you "play it cool with them down there" then they will love you, and Manley has played on this because he is not black, his mother is not black and his father was not termed black in the Jamaican situation. However, Manley is not a prejudiced man. At least, I don't know what he does at home, but on the streets he can "hug up" and "kiss up", and when someone like him does this to black people, he becomes one of them, because they did not expect him to do that. On the other hand, if I (a truly black man) go out there and "hug up" and "kiss up" in a crowd this would not be seen as anything special. I am expected to behave in that manner, but Manley is not expected to, therefore his behaviour (though identical to mine) is more attractive. The same thing would apply to Seaga. That is really a description of the situation.

SIMMS: How would you compare Mr. Manley in relationship to the present Prime Minister, Mr. Seaga?

MP(JLP): Manley and Seaga are two different kinds of persons, yet they are similar in many ways, as far as I am concerned. Both, I think, don't like to lose, but Seaga is a genuine person and Manley is not, in terms of the political (now let me explain that). When I say Manley is not, I don't mean that there is nothing genuine. I am talking about specifics. Now, Seaga is a sociologist and a professional. Before politics he had spent his whole life doing research in music, culture and art. The Rastafari Movement was studied by him, the dancing, the African cult, the Revivial cult--all are part of him. I happen to have gone to a "table" with him one night, and I don't believe in it. I laughed during the rituals, and he turned to me and said, "I don't think you should laugh". I said, "Eddie, you know this is complete nonsense--these getting spirits and falling down". He said to me, "Look, if you allow yourself, you will get into the same situation". Now I don't believe that, I don't believe that anyone can make me jump up and fall down like that, however I know that Seaga is not exploiting this for politics. Manley, on the other hand, really knew that people liked him and he knew that he had the qualities that they liked (which he inherits) and he can "lay on" the rest. He knows what to say, he says it like they want to hear it. He is a manipulator of symbols. He is always finding the right word--"Better must come", "Unity", etc. He is classy. When we (the JLP) got "Deliverence" in the last election, I am sure it might have been "head spinning" to him because those are the kinds of symbols that he manipulates. He carried a rod for ten years, a rod he got from Haile Selassie (I don't believe this came from any one in Africa). When he held out the rod, he had the same kind of Revival charisma. This is what he exhibits but it is for a political reason.

Seaga has never (I have been in the party for ten years) manipulated Revival for political reasons. It is a once a year situation when he attends the ceremonies to be a part of them. Manley carried the rod; anywhere he was seen he had it. He was a manipulator. Now, let me say this, I am not suggesting that he is wrong. I am not saying that the type of manipulation that I am talking about is one which I wouldn't do because all politicians seek to find the best way of mobilizing the people, because you need their vote and support. So I'm not suggesting that this is wrong, but I would like to get back to the point that he can create around him the necessary support for leadership, but I don't think he could perform and hold that. This is my personal feeling.

Seaga himself is not a charismatic person. Unlike Manley, Seaga is a more constructive, planning person who can look at the long term and the short term and come up with decisions with a disciplined mine. I think Michael Manley, on the other hand, is extremely undisciplined. He overspends on the rash basis--"We have to build this road, we have to get it off, I don't care whether there is money or not--the road has to be built". Seaga would never do this, he would have to sit down and plan and watch the budget, etc. I am not in a position to say which is the best approach--I think both have advantages and disadvantages. I don't know which are the greatest qualities of a leader. In my opinion, Bustamante has been the greatest leader that this country has had so far, and I try to base my style on his, because I believe that if you are too bright you cannot be a good leader because you tend to believe like Norman Manley who thought he had all the answers. Bustamante, not a bright fellow, not an intellectual of any class, was bright enough to recognize people who have the ability and put them to perform and certainly, like the captain of a cricket team, he might have made "ducks" but his guys bowled the other team down. Bustamante was that sort of man. Seaga, as a team captain, would go out to bowl the team down, do all the batting himself and umpire the game. This is bad, in my opinion. Now where would we put Michael Manley as a cricketer? I think Manley would only lead the team when they are making runs. If they make no runs, he gets sick. In other words, I can recall that Manley has never made a bad announcement. He always gets someone else to make bad announcements but he has always announced the great things and gets the claps and the praise.

That, in essence, is how I see the type of leadership that they exhibit, but as I said, in a political system most politicians will try to see where people are most vulnerable, where their Achilles heel is--whether it is in the church, in the canefield, in sports, or just in plain kissing the people or in loving the women or in being handsome--thus being charismatic.

To sum up, while Seaga will give a little handshake, Michael grabs you and hugs you. He loves it and he plays it well--one has to give him his due--but there is no longevity in that sort of situation. It plays out too quickly.

SIMMS: There hasn't been any longevity in any Jamaican political leader. They have all been "two term" leaders. Does our society foster this?

MP(JLP): It is because they have not been able to manipulate the political system for longer than two terms. What has happened is that people vote for persons and not political parties. There is only a small portion of the voters who vote for the party. If a political leader wants to get more than two terms, he has to manipulate the people by shifting political symbols and people. In the JLP, there are many people who voted for our candidates in the last selection, and who are now telling us that if those persons were being put up again they wouldn't vote for them. Therefore, one gets the people to vote by listening to what they say and reacting to it. If one does this then one can win. I think all parties will get two terms. The great challenge of any Jamaican leader is to get three terms. The Jamaican political system is based on a number of promises, and if the promises are not met, then the government in power is not given too many chances.

SIMMS: How did Manley become such a force in Third World politics?

MP(JLP): I have told you that he is a bright fellow. His rhetoric, his grammar and his vocabulary are of the highest order. He is a scholar trained in one of the good British universities and, as such, in any forum he is extremely attractive. He knows what to say, he knows where to say it and he is from Jamaica. His father was a national hero and his mother is a "top class" person. So he is way ahead of most. Even when he lost his government and almost lost his seat, the polls show that he is more charismatic than the present Prime Minister and people still say, "We love him, but--". They still love, still love him!

NEWSPAPER EDITOR:

JOURNALIST AND OPPONENT OF THE PNP

NEWSPAPER EDITOR: Manley has what is commonly called charisma. This charisma is linked to his possession of four qualities:

1) a dominant personality
2) personability--he is flamboyant and glamorous
3) a gift of oratory
4) political instinct

Having these four attributes has made him charismatic, however, there is a quality which he lacks and that is "dedication to industry". Had he possessed this quality, he would have been transformed from an attractive leader to a great leader. In spite of this, the four mentioned characteristics have made him a formidable political opponent.

One can understand Manley's loss at the polls by seeing his obvious strengths as clues to his weaknesses. For instance, the gifts of oratory and personability encourage the element of vanity which is in everyone. This, sharpened by the adulation which one gets and which leads on to flattery. Thus one's ability to judge character becomes clouded by the predilection to listen only to positive commentary. In such a climate, the critic is not tolerated. Michael Manley's greatest weakness has been and continues to be, an over-confidence in his oratorical skills. To him, the word becomes the deed and misfortunes can be explained away by rhetoric and this explanation becomes the justification and the rectification.

His need to be surrounded by adulation might be related to his background. He grew up in an exemplary home with two outstanding parents and was always surrounded by troupes of distinguished visitors. His home, Drumblair, became a shrine for the literati who grasped for alliance with the Manleys. They did not necessarily seek alliance with the party. There was, therefore, a cult dimension to the environment in which Manley grew up.

When he returned to Jamaican in the fifties and entered the National Workers' Union, he carved for himself the role of brilliant advocate and in this role his talent of oratory was very effective. From this base he moved from success to success and these climaxed in his 1972 victory at the polls and him becoming Prime Minister of Jamaica.

Emboldened by his success, he started to move more to the Left and this started his steady decline from favour.

In all this, he has had a tremendous influence on the society, especially on the youth. He caused them to question old values, but he did not help them to replace the old with the new. He therefore created a vacuum, thus he disoriented the society by laying a fuzzy path that was open to all types of interpretation.

In other words, Manley is brilliant at analyzing what is wrong but is incapable in coming up with suitable solutions. He is an "orator of the negative".

THE LEADER OF ANOTHER POLITICAL PARTY

PARTY LEADER: Specifically, I will make some brief comments about Manley and his style. I think on the positive side--the side that I consider as his strengths--he undoubtedly has a very sincere, genuine and powerful feeling for the poor; a strong disgust with oppression; a high sense of justice in regard to inequalities and unfairness of all sorts, and this means that he speaks with great feeling on all matters that are connected into areas of justice--fair play, equality, the rights of people who are the underdog and oppressed and so on. Quite obviously, this leads to an empathy--that is a connection--between the oppressed people and Manley; a two-way relationship in which both parties are influenced. When this two-way relationship is supplemented by practical work which helps the people and which occurred during the term of office in which he was Prime Minister, then it means that the bond becomes quite a strong one. By implication, I am saying that I do not accept the simplistic notions of charisma which do not explain anything but simply confess the inability to explain. Charisma is a relationship rather than a quality.

This relationship is more and more subject to material elements, so that for the leader who is said to be charismatic, charisma becomes a significant political factor only at that point when his practical work on behalf of the masses is perceived to be helpful. Thus charisma takes a very big dip, in fact charisma turns into its opposite at that point when the material content of the relationship is reduced or emptied completely. In other words, the view that Manley is a charismatic person and that this charisma is responsible for his method begs more questions than it answers. One needs to ask, for example, "What hapened to this charisma in 1980?" If it disappeared, then it clearly cannot be equated to a physical appearance, or it cannot be equated to any style. It has to be equated to the perception of whether he has the ability to meet the needs of the masses of the people or not. Equally, if that charisma disappeared on November 1st, 1980, how is it now reappearing in 1983? It is reappearing because of the perceived inability of the current leadership (Seaga and JLP) to meet the needs of the people. A lot of journalistic writing which passes for academic scholarship is around this whole issue of charisma as an aspect of leadership.

In relation to weaknesses, I think that one of the weaknesses in Manley's leadership style (though I have some shortcomings with his overall political and ideological outlook) would be an insufficient understanding of the capacities and ultimate potential of the working class--the major component of the working people, and the other side of that coin could be an overrating of the power of imperialism. This leads, therefore, to insufficient boldness in mobilizing, organizing and galvanizing the power of the people as a means of anchoring policies and programs which naturally and inevitably stimulate the class opposition of the ruling circles and of imperialism.

So if we look at his style in relation to situations of acute national class struggle, his weaknesses become apparent. His inclination in those circumstances is to compromise more than is necessary, given the balance of forces between the working class and the working people nationally, regionally and internationally and the bourgeoisie nationally, regionally and internationally. Nothing is wrong with compromise (politics is built on compromises), but compromises have to be determined in relation to the balance of forces and this needs to be exactly calculated and not distorted one way or the other by perceptions of the sort which I believe he had.

In that context, then, we get an inclination to compromise more with the ruling circles than is necessary and we fail to extend to the working classes as much as is possible. Along with this is the reflection in terms of advisors. In those circumstances, the advisors who predominate are those who would be in accord with this inclination. The style of consultation which is an important style and one that is necessary then becomes a cover for class weaknesses based on the factors which I have outlined. To give an example of this: In June of 1980 there was an attempted coup in Jamaica. It was widely and naturally condemned by all social classes and it was quite obvious that at that moment when this attempted coup was exposed, the balance of forces in relation to the unconstitutional elements in the security forces had changed dramatically in favor of the most progressive elements who were also the most constitutional in the sense of support for the government. Here was an opportunity to act decisively to reduce the presence of and to weaken the unconstitutional reactionary officer corps. However, like all decisive action in the course of a class struggle, to carry this, the politician who claims to be progressive but who also is only going to take action when there are no risks, will be paralyzed and will certainly not be able to serve. Manley did not act decisively. I think this example is particularly good because it was a case in which the masses of the people (not metaphorically, but literally) were calling for firm and decisive action against the coupists and plotters.

A public meeting in Half-Way Tree is still very clear to me. The people kept calling, "Let us move now", and Manley kept trying to keep the people quiet by saying, "No, no, no". He ended up in this case in effect retaining the composition, structure and class character of the security forces inherited from the JLP who inherited it from the colonial regime. This turned out to be a mistake which is inherent in this style. This was of great significance when the electoral struggles began to take the form of reactionary terrorism and the security forces did not obey the directives of the constitutional government but were, in fact, in many cases, found associating themselves with terroristic elements. I think there were other examples of this as well, but that case is the one which comes immediately to mind.

I feel that the whole question of worker participation is another case in point. It was fairly clear that the rank and file workers--the most conscious and advanced amongst them--were very much in favour of some effective worker participation model; it was equally clear that important elements within the bureaucracy were not. Here again was a situation in which a risk would have been involved, but an effort to really galvanize the rank and file would have been able to neutralize the hostility of the union bureaucrats and bring about an important deepening of the democratic process, particularly around the issue of passing enabling legislation, which is what was being proposed. I can remember being in many meetings with other trade unionists when we were saying that what was needed was not compelling legislation, not that you were going to say that everybody should have worker participation, but that in those enterprises and work centres where the workers, by whatever process, indicated a desire to have a worker participation program, then the law should give them support and the management should not, in that context, be able to prevent the participation from taking place.

This is another example of what I mean by exaggerating the power of the ruling circles and underrating that of the working people leading to what is popularly called "being soft", but what in class terms means a social democratic attempt at compromising more with the opponents of the people than the situation in fact requires.

There are numerous other examples relating to the community councils and relating to the whole business of institutionalizing the right of recall within the PNP itself: that is to ensure that the Members of Parliament and caretakers and Cabinets would be subject to recall by the party if they didn't fulfil the mandate and live up to the promises that they had given. This weakness, interestingly enough, but not surprisingly, would show itself least of all in the international sphere because it is in the international sphere that the balance of forces, in the period of the seventies, was most obviously changing in favour of the revolutionary and progressive movements, and therefore it was more difficult to take Rightest positions in that context. Strong decisions were taken on many controversial questions. For instance, on the Cuban assistance to the Angolans in January 1976 (I think it was), Manley did resist Kissinger's attempt to dictate what Jamaica should do or how we should vote in relation to that issue, but at that point insufficient confidence in the masses reflects itself in his unwillingness to be fully and totally honest in taking into account all the realities of politics. This Kissinger example is a good one. It was in January 1976 (if I am not mistaken), that this attempt by Kissinger to dictate to the Jamaican government existed and we, the people (except for the ones who were "in the know" at that time) only knew about this attempt in 1982, six years after, in the publication of the book, Struggle in the Periphery. This is not true of Manley's attitude to the bourgeoisie and to the propertied elements, in that these are confidants, but the masses are not. This has to do with social upbringing, friendships and so on, but also, I believe, because of an insufficient confidence in the capabilities of the people as a demcratic and revolutionary force and therefore an insufficient impetus to come clean to them with important political and other information which would assist in the development of their national and patriotic sentiments as well as their class consciousness.

SIMMS: You are introducing a contradiction of sorts, because many others see him as having a terrific respect for the masses. How far can this be carried if their abilities are not recognized?

PARTY LEADER: It's a contradiction. I would say that he has a tremendous feeling for the poor and a tremendous love for the masses. If, by respect, one means a conviction in their capability to run things, I think that is less than it is portrayed to be. Let me put this in another way--Manley will have great difficulty, and I think he will probably admit this, in leading a process in which the struggle between the masses and the ruling circles reaches such an acute point, reaches such a high temperature, that the people are compelled to reply to their enemies who use force against them, by revolutionary force. I would find great difficulty in seeing Manley as a Paul Bogle or a Sam Sharpe, not just for personal psychological reason (everybody is afraid, nobody likes violence and all of that), but I think there is a broader point of insufficient conviction in the capacity of the people to firmly rebuff the ruling circles. I really feel that there is a problem there.

If we draw a contrast with Maurice Bishop--when the Americans did to Bishop in May of 1979 what they tried to do with Manley in January of 1976--Maurice was on the radio within a week, telling the people that the Americans had attempted to dictate to Grenada what their policy should be in relation to Cuba. Manley wrote this in his book six years later. Now you can explain this, and many will do so, by saying that the situation was sufficiently different in that in Grenada there was a revolutionary process and in Jamaica there was a constitutional one. I don't accept that as the full explanation at all, for the reason that the rupture in the relations with the U.S.A. which came as a result of the elaboration of the democratic and progressive anti-imperialist course, came anyway; so to say that you couldn't give the people some indication of what Kissinger was trying to do--which would have immensely advanced their consciousness of what imperialism is, of what U.S. policy is in relation to countries like Jamaica, thus immensely improving their preparedness to defend the government about social democratic reservations of the capacities of the people, even at the same time as there is great love and consequently respect for them.

SIMMS: Is he trapped by his training? Is Democratic Socialism limiting? Risky?

PARTY LEADER: It is a dialectical process. Nobody ever switches in that sense, but there are many influences which incline towards the development of persons who are trained in western social democracy towards a more revolutionary outlook. There are also many influences which impel them to remain within that framework. In the Third World context these two sets of influences are operating at any one point in time and it depends on a number of factors which eventually come together. Undoubtedly I was trained in a social democratic tradition amidst all the influences--intellectual and otherwise--at this University (UWI) in the early sixties. I was trained to be worse at Oxford in the late 1960's. Maurice Bishop had similar experiences. Fidel Castro started out his political life, not as a revolutionary in the strictest sense, but as a highly progressive person. One can name a number of cases where personalities who are involved in politics get a certain training and orientation, but the training and orientation reveals its limitation in dealing with the fundamental issues facing the masses. At that point, at some stage in that process, there is a choice: you either have to back off dealing with the fundamental issues in a fundamental way and therefore deal with them in a superficial and reformist way, or you make the transition to being a more revolutionary leader with a more revolutionary outlook and more revolutionary inclinations. I think there were possibilities for Michael Manley to make that transition--there is no question in my mind that he would have had a real possibility to make that transition most of all in the first months of 1977, and the second opportunity presented itself between March and October of 1980. Maybe a third opportunity will present itself if this present government plays on their perception of his social democratic liberal two-sidedness and constitutionalism, and calls the bluff about confrontation when election is to be held in this country and they hold it on the old voters' list and obviously rob the election legally. Once again, history will present an opportunity to either remain within a framework which the ruling classes reject or accept when it suits them--namely the constitution which they drew up and which they use and abuse as they see fit--or to recognize that the peoples' interest is primary and that if a government does what this government is about to do, if it does so, then what the American Declaration of Rights says applies, "that any rulers that abuse the trust put in them, their rule has to be confronted, and the form of government changed". This is not anything Marxist. It is a revolutionary democratic concept[1].

So it's complicated, but at particular moments leaders of our type and sort of background, have the opportunity either to advance or regress, because it is not possible to stand still in the Third World conditions and maintain a commitment to the masses which is not just in words but in deeds.

I fear that Michael Manley's opportunities are now lost. His book, Struggle in the Periphery, reveals a hardening of a European social democratic outlook--undoubtedly one still inclined to the Left, but Social Democracy in any event--and that means in essence an attempt to reconcile the oppressed with the oppressors by extended reforms, but by reforms in any event leading the structure and the system the way it is.

SIMMS: Some people argue that Jamaicans choose their leaders because of what they can deliver on the material level, but also that leaders like Michael Manley have a historical, emotional impact. In other words, he

[1] This interview was done before the JLP announced its intention of the snap election which was held on December 15th, 1983.

is from the right class. Do people like Manley and Seaga have an easier entrance into leadership than, say, a black Jamaican of whatever intellect or integrity?

PARTY LEADER: There is some truth to that, but we need to understand that our people have two sides to them. Like any people, they have a side which is deeply drawn to colonial traditions and influences, which include a high degree of racism and hatred for themselves. Also, they have another side to them--a revolutionary side. In other words, both Anancy, the spider man, and Paul Bogle, are heroes. Anancy dancing around and trying to act smart without any risk, Bogle giving his life. I think these two elements are very much in the psychology of the people, in their collective consciousness and in their political movement. Leaders, therefore, who play on the backward elements and side of the people do have a foundation for so doing, hence Seaga's promotion of Pocamania is a very clear scientific attempt to use backwardness in the interest of maintaining the rule and the popular basis of the ruling circles. We could multiply these examples over and over again--the Queen, etc. There are many, many ways in which this is done. However, the revolutionary side of the people is also there, and there is a constant tussle between the two. The revolutionary side, by definition, is more often than not the underdog in normal times, but is seeking expression constantly and is facilitated by leaders who seek to bring it out and try to avoid opportunism and right wing reaction and so on. In that framework, it is perhaps harder, but it is not an idealistic enterprise to try to guide and lead people based on a struggle to overcome the backwardness and to enlarge, to promote and to facilitate the further development of their revolutionary side.

I think that we, in our historical and political development, can see both elements tussling with one another. I think that the initial inclination to Bustamante expressed the two things almost side by side, which is a peculiarity of it. He did take a very strong stand on confronting the oligarchy of the colonial system, and at the same time this was assisted by his physical and other characteristics. However, the difficulty that he had in pacifying the people once they began to move, in an indication of that real underlying revolutionary inclination. If you read some of his speeches, it becomes apparent that he had this difficulty.

The fact is that black people did play an important role at the grassroots level in bringing out and guiding the people. In the 1960's, the love for and attachment to Walter Rodney indicates that this revolutionary underpinning was sufficiently present to provide the basis for a popular following of a leader of that sort. So I do think that leaders such as Manley do have some advantages in normal times, but the more the times get turbulent is the more what is normally an advantage becomes a disadvantage. It is very, very contradictory.

SIMMS: In your opinion, did Michael Manley manipulate (consciously or unconsciously) the semi-revolutionary elements like the Rastafarians in the same way that Seaga now uses the Pocomania?

PARTY LEADER: The fact of the matter is that leaders like Manley and Seaga do have a relationship with the masses and with the workers. The question is not the quantity of the relationship, but the quality of it.

I was referring earlier on to one of the weaknesses. I should have given you the example of the National Workers' Union which brought Michael Manley very close to the working class and the working people for a number of years, however, insufficient attempts to make that union more democratic in terms of the workers of the rank and file level, in terms of the political education of the workers, in terms of their respresentation in the leading structures of the union, is an indication of the weakness of which I spoke, for there is no one who in my view has a genuinely revolutionary outlook beyond social democracy that could be involved in a union which has industrial proletariats for so many years and not accomplish much more, despite the extreme difficulties, which I can tell you about, of making democratic structures in this country--which are really frozen into oligarchic patterns in this country. I think more could have been accomplished had there been more confidence in the capacity of the rank and file to do so on a continuing basis as distinct from doing so in the moment of crisis, e.g., the JBC strike of 1964.

SIMMS: From my observation of the PNP--the information (education) filters down. What is your party's approach to educating the masses?

PARTY LEADER: I would say that we are not much more in touch with the working class than the PNP because they have a much bigger party, a longer tradition and they have established supporters amongst the workers in different parts of the country, but the quality of our relationship--lesser than theirs as it is--is definitely different not just in the educational sense but in the practical sense. In the leading bodies of the trade union that I head, I am the only non-manual worker in the executive, and it is not a tokenistic gesture. The union meets and functions without my being there. The most historical strike that we called in 1972 was called on a decision reached while I was away from the island.

The question, therefore, of the structures which are, in the union's case, a majority of working class people being paralysed by the absence of the leader is not important, because they function in a collective way and take correct and effective decisions. In the party, the representation of the working class in the executive or the central committee as we call it, is also quite significant in relation to parties of the Left in the Caribbean, for the reason that our principles and their application to our conditions require every possibility of facilitating the workers who by their deeds reveal themselves to be in advance of the others, not because we say so, but because they prove within the course of their daily life and struggle that they are. Those principles require that these people be advanced into positions of ability to take decisions and not simply be "foot soldiers" or middle level cadres or whatever it may be. It also reflects itself on the educational side in that while we agree on certain things and put out a large number of pamphlets which are aimed at political education, the content of these pamphlets as well as the method of using them has to be informed by the views, experiences and responses of the working class people. That is how we try to combine the education from what we consider to be a scientific perspective with the necessity to root this perspective in the concrete cultural, social and historical experiences and conditions of the people with whom we are dealing; that is, the

Jamaican people, not people of Cuba or the Soviet Union, though we accept the view that the general laws of social development apply equally but their expressions are very different in the racial, social and cultural characteristics of the people.

C. MANLEY FAMILY MEMBERS

FAMILY MEMBER A

FAMILY MEMBER A: I will begin by saying that I have a notion of charisma that cannot be seen in isolation from the person, his background, his socioeconomic perspective etc. In other words, I don't think that a person is born charismatic. In the case of Michael Manley, I think there are certain things that one has to bear in mind. First of all, the family from which he came.

His father was one of the architects of Jamaican independence and, to that extent, was very, very important in the leadership of the movement for self-government and universal adult suffrage at a time when people thought he was crazy to think that poor black people could govern themselves, and should have the vote. I am going to talk about his father for a few minutes because I do not thnk that you can understand the son unless you have an understanding of the father.

Norman Manley, the father, started out by carrying out social welfare projects, mainly under Jamaica Welfare, which he founded in the early thirties. Later on in the thirties, when he had become a legal luminary in the region, he realized that he was not satisfied with what he was doing. He wanted to do more and he was approached by a group of people to start a political party. At that time, he refused because he said that, "Jamaica's problems were economic, not political". Within a few months, when he was again approached, he realized that there was need for an organized political party and so he gathered around him a wide variety of people, including, I would say, liberals, progressives, and certain right wingers. The whole idea was to form a national movement that would contain all types of people with all types of ideologies, with the main purpose of bringing about universal adult suffrage and some form of self-government. At the time, self-government was a bit ill-defined, but at least they knew they were together for this purpose and they went through a number of struggles.

I am going into all this because, in the case of Norman Manley, I think he suffered the many contradictions that people of his class background would suffer. On the one hand, he wanted to work with the masses while, on the other hand, he was being held back by certain things within himself. For him, the burning question was, "How far can I go?" Here was a man who one day would be on the streets marching with the masses, but he was a legal luminary, therefore he would also have access to the colonial governor with whom he could drink tea and share a certain level of intellectual stimulation. As Governor Richards said, and I quote, "Nowhere in the British Empire had I met a man like Manley". So inherent in the man were the contradictions and, therefore, inherent in the party were the contradictions.

Michael Manley, then, is a product of this kind of father and also the product of a mother who is not just known regionally but throughout the world as a great sculptor. A lot of the work that she produced in the thirties and forties were social protest themes. For instance, she prophesied through one of her works, Negro Aroused, the turbulence that was to come in 1938. This work portrayed the head of a negro raised high, firm and determined.

This is the household that Michael grew up in, a household unlike the household of the majority of Jamaicans. Both parents were professionals, so he would from very early, be associated with books, his verandah would have been full of people in the arts because, while his father was the leader of the political movement, his mother was the leader of the cultural movement. So you have this kind of background which could have made it very easy for such a man to go off into one of the professions. He had the ability to do whatever he decided to do.

He studied abroad, and a great influence on him during his student years was Harold Laski, the Fabian Socialist. Laski lectured to him and these ideas had, and continue to have, a profound influence on him. Most of his Socialist thoughts are based on a Fabian type of Socialism. This is what the PNP now calls Democratic Socialism. It is not socialism in the scientific sense--a la USSR--but very much a variant of it. Based on Fabian Socialism, this brand takes a very moral and ethical approach to things--not necessarily a class approach but a moralist approach. For instance, "Cuba is a member of the region. Why shouldn't Cuba have the right to choose her friends", etc., etc. would be a logical argument.

After leaving the London School of Economics, Michael worked as a journalist and came back home as such on a very meagre salary. Then he went into trade unions. This is where I think you can begin to see the beginnings of what was to end up being his charisma. He was not only involved in the union movement, but he was one of the persons who founded the National Workers' Union. If he did not found it (I could be mistaken on this), he was certainly one of the persons who worked during the first year to set it up. He is purported to have driven around in an old standard motor car with a loudspeaker attached, and went to the factory gates and put on a "one man show". He therefore came up in his struggle with the masses in a very hard and difficult way, particularly difficult for someone from his class background. He worked in the trade union movement for twenty-one years before he became a political leader. His work in the movement demonstrated that he was developing a close relationship with grassroots people on a day to day, hour by hour basis. He had to go into the cane fields. It wasn't a matter of staying in an air conditioned office and looking out at the workers. Instead, he was in the cane fields working with the workers, feeling the mosquitoes, feeling the bites, feeling the hardship of the work and, again because of the Fabian background and the related morals and ethics, he felt that the conditions were unjust. He had a very strong sense of justice and so he built up quite a rapport with the workers.

I think that another great influence too would be that a lot of people saw some of Bustamante in him. Bustamante was a first cousin of Norman Manley, and there are people who say that Michael exemplifies the best in Norman and Bustamante. He is seen as having the grassroots appeal of a Bustamante and the intellect of a Norman Manley. In fact, he also has the physical features that capture something of both of them. His pigmentation is more like that of Bustamante than of his father. All this will have to be taken into account when his charisma is being dealt with.

There is no doubt that the basis for Michael Manley's charismatic leadership would be a man who people saw as a worker's man before anything else. The workers saw him as their man and, in fact, throughout his career he won many battles for the workers. Some of these can be criticized, of course, but from the worker's point of view (for instance in the case of bauxite workers, to name one group), he was seen as their man, and is still seen as such by many even though many of them voted against him in 1980 for other reasons. When he comes on the scene, he is still their Joshua (the biblical image of Joshua breaking the walls of Jericho down).

What I am trying to do all the time is to relate charisma to concrete situations. When Michael Manley came to office in 1972, there is no doubt that after about eight years of independence under the Jamaica Labor Party, the people were very dissatisfied, extremely dissatisfied. There were a number of riots in Jamaica, including race riots, and people were saying, "We want a change because independence has made no difference for us". In Michael Manley, the new leader of the People's National Party, they saw somebody who would at least do something on behalf of the working class because he had twenty-one years' experience in the fields. This is how he campaigned--on a platform, not an ideological one in the sense of a label, but ideological in the sense that he was always talking about justice for the oppressed in the society, and one of the films which we did in those early years is one called, Joshua. (I will lend you this film) It is a documentation of the campaign of 1972. This we used very successfully. It was made and used at a time when all the objective conditions in the country were moving towards change; the songs that were being sung had themes like "Power for the People", etc., all tying in with a philosophy which the PNP was subscribing to at the time. So when we came to office in 1972, the expectancy rate was very high and, in fact, even the people who criticize us will talk about the social programs, so there again, people would see that as a continuation of their idea of this man as a workers' man. The man who has given them maternity leave with pay and the man who brought forward all these rights for workers. It was unbelievable, the condition of some of those laws that we had to change at the time.

To sum up, I would say that certainly in Michael Manley's case, the charisma is related to something very concrete in his own experience. Most of his life was given to working with grassroots people. During his years in office, he extended the relationship among the oppressed to the international sphere where Jamaica played a very, very important part in organizations such as the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations. This is not to say that we weren't members of these before, but instead of continuing to take a back seat, we took the initiative in these areas. Thus Manley's charisma was experienced beyond Jamaica's geographical boundaries, and he also became important in a number of mediation issues arising out of his trade union career. Issues such as apartheid in Southern Africa gained much of his attention, because invariably he would sit on committees with the First World nations and play his part.

When I speak to you next, I will discuss the charismatic element inside the People's National Party and discuss how the leadership inside the party responded. We will look at both the positive and the negative side of this, because there is no doubt that there were negatives. For instance, Michael just had to get up in the middle of a debate and make his position clear and the debate would end. Inside the room it would end, but when we go outside the debate would continue behind his back, therefore there is no doubt that there are problems, severe problems with charismatic leadership. Next time, I will be more critical of some of the aspects of charismatic leadership, not just with Michael Manley, but generally.

SIMMS: I will replay the end of our last conversation and ask you to continue developing the theme that you were discussing.

FAMILY MEMBER A: Inside the top forums of the PNP, e.g., The National Executive Council, Michael had a tendency (depending on the issue which was being discussed and depending on the extent of his interest in the issue or an interest in the outcome), to play a very decisive role. He would approach an issue before us (e.g., the decision on whether we should stay with the IMF or not) by making a twenty minute statement and making his position very clear. This was one of the ways in which he handled such situations. The minute he did this, members of the Executive--I would say the majority of the members of the Executive--would accept what he said and note the way he wanted them to vote. There would always be a sort of conflictual situation because there was a minority--usually a minority group on the left--who would become suspicious the minute he opened the debate in that way, and would be very critical of the position that he took. Most times, when the vote was cast, the decision would be on his side, because in the end, people (neutralists) on the Executive would listen to the debate, sometimes get confused, and then say "whatever the leader says". Thus, I think charismatic leadership assumes even larger importance when the levels of development inside the party are fairly low; not only uneven, but low on even levels. So, invariably, you will get a situation where the people say, "I don't care who says what, whatever the leader says is what I am going with".

So that's one way--he makes a statement!

Another way in which he approached decision-making was by entering a debate with the following caveat: "I do not want to influence the decision, I am just going to listen to everybody. I have feelings about it but I am saying nothing. I will be led by whatever the Executive decides". The debate then goes on for hours and then at the end he would sum up the debate. In summing up, he would insist that he was not influencing, but somehow during the course of the summation, he managed to make his position quite clear, so that even if the debate was tending to go one way, in the end the vote would go his way.

I think this would be true of the running of the party up to the 1980 IMF debate, when we took the decision to leave the IMF. I think that was a watershed period in the party because this was one of the really important issues and people weren't necessarily going to vote with the leader. They were very clear that the reality of the Jamaican situation showed that the IMF connection was unworkable. This was not a conscious ideological decision. Objectively, party leaders could no longer hold group meetings because of the escalating prices and costs of all goods and services. The massive layoffs, etc., made it impossible for party members to live with the IMF conditions. Executive members came to the floor of the National Executive Council knowing that they would have to break whether the Cabinet liked it or not, or whether the leader liked it or not.

Here then was at least one issue where the objective conditions existing in the country demanded a break whether the subjective conditions wanted it or not. This then was a major sort of watershed in the Party. The majority went away from what the leader would have preferred, although as I can remember it, in that debate he did not make his position clear at the outset, yet you could feel that he would have preferred if we had gone back into the IMF and then made the break at a later date.

To make a more general point, I think that charismatic leadership can succeed to the extent that the people you are leading have not yet reached a really high level of development, a level where they can be objective, because charisma can be a highly subjective quality and people tend to follow such leaders the way they follow Jesus Christ--unquestioningly. The moment you start to build the kind of party structure where you ask people to analyse data and deal with things objectively, then the charismatic leader diminishes and this process will cause problems. I think this might have been a contributing factor to Maurice Bishop's problems in Grenada.

In the last two years, the members of the PNP have been trying to build up the kind of party in which the constituency executives receive political education on a monthly basis, therefore when this group came to Annual Conference as delegates or whatever, they contributed to a different level of discussion. People were no longer willing to accept anything that the top leadership said. They were now questioning decisions and attitudes at this level. In such a climate, the role of the charismatic leader decreases, and the role of the party increases.

In addition to all this, the PNP can be seen as really divided in factions of Right, Centre and Left (however one wants to put it). For the purposes of this discussion, we will use Right and Left as the two main factions. The leader (fitting Rex Nettleford's description of Norman Manley) becomes a kind of compromiser/balancer. To a large extent, Michael Manley sees leadership in the same way. (As I said before, to understand him, you have to understand his father and how his father led the party.) I am not sure to what extent Michael realizes this linkage or is conscious of it, but the research that I have done on Norman Manley reveals a man who is frightfully reincarnated in his son.

They both see themselves in the balancer role between the two tendencies in the party--the Right and the Left. They juggle both in such a way that the Right sometimes makes gains at some point and at other points the Left makes gains. Without the charisma, it would be almost impossible to maintain this so-called balance, therefore charisma is used, from time to time, in the interest of one ideology or another. The Left or the Right can be made to keep quiet on an issue if the leader comes on powerful and strong enough on a particular issue. I think, to a large extent, the main characteristic of the charismatic leader has to be his ability to manipulate not only individuals, but groupings within his party or political structure. This is not to be seen necessarily in a negative connotation. I am merely saying that one must be able to do this if you are to carry on that kind of leadership style.

Michael Manley can always be seen in the middle with the tendencies on both sides, and he has always said publicly that he could not lead a party that did not consist of different tendencies. He sees the party as one that would welcome all who wanted to join.

We have had private discussions on the extent to which the PNP should become a Left party and have tendencies within the Left, but I think he sees his leadership as straddling the Right, the Left and the Centre; to him the success of his leadership depends on the extent to which he could have a harmonious whole. If he was having a meeting with the top echelons of the party he would choose the perceived leader of the Right, for instance a P.J. Patterson and a leader of the Left, like a D. K. Duncan, and all three would get together and arrive at a consensus. This is another key to his particular type of charismatic leadership: apart from the ability to manipulate is the ability to get people to arrive at a consensus. These are skills which have come out of his trade union background where, when you are talking to the workers, what you strive for is consensus, so that you don't get a situation where some vote and some abstain. In the end you work out the kind of program that has a little something for everyone to accept. This style has negative overtones because in compromising, you have to accept ideas or situations that you really don't agree with fundamentally. So one finds that inside a party like the PNP with a charismatic leader like Michael Manley, there are always little pockets of grievances, either because people are afraid to stand up to him in meetings and say what they have to say (the situation I described in our first discussion) or for other reasons. What people generally do then, is agree inside the meeting because the leader will get upset if it is not a unanimous vote. On the outside, the dissatisfied individuals hold their private meetings among their tendencies, and the major decision is subverted in this way. Hence, a political decision might have been taken, e.g., "Political education is paramount in 1980 and everyone will push this", and those of us who are supposed to offer this program find that the leadership in some constituencies is not involved, hence the people (rank and file) do not get involved. Instead, they become suspicious of the people who are trying to carry out the program. In other words, although inside the decision making body of the party an agreement (consensus or unanimous) was reached, outside, individuals do whatever they feel like doing. Hence one of the problems of the charismatic leader is that he looms so large that people are terrified to express their true feelings if these are in opposition to his. On the other hand, those who are not terrified and who are at a fairly high level of development and will stand up and deal with the leader in these forums, get described as "anti-leader". In such a structure and climate the worst label is that of "anti-leader" if the leader is charismatic, because part of the charismatic aura is the holiness and godliness--therefore such a leader can do no wrong. There are even those who capitulate by saying, "Even if we don't understand why he wants us to take this decision, he must know. It is in his head, he can't tell us everything". Herein lies the assumption of a godlike quality. What I would see as the most negative aspect of Manley's charismatic leadership is his ability to manipulate either the women, the youth (even though this would be the most difficult group to manipulate), individuals (even left-wing ones capitulate to the sheer power of his personality) and groups.

In a way, the most dangerous kind of charismatic leader is not the working class leader, but the petit bourgeois charismatic leader, because this latter has things going for him that a working class charismatic leader would not have. It is the petit bourgeois who cream off the best in the society in terms of education, social contacts in the Jamaican experience--the complexion and the family background. All of these attributes bolster and add to an even greater claim to charisma. Michael Manley, the essence of the petit bourgeois leader, the brightest and the best, who talks well, manipulates well, and does everything so well, overwhelms those who see themselves as low men on the totem pole.

This presents problems, yet on the other hand, a leader can either follow behind his people, walk alongside them or go out to the front and lead. At different times in the movement, Michael Manley has done all three. For instance, a good example of him leading the party away ahead of everyone else was in the relationship that he established with Cuba. This came about because he did it. He just did it. He just got up one day, flew on a plane to Algeria with Fidel Castro, and the rest of us were left panting behind; even those in the Left, not understanding why he had made this bold move--out of the blue. The rest of us had to literally run behind him in order to catch up with him. Thus, charisma can be used in a very progressive way--to pull people forward. Manley has done this largely in international relations and in foreign policies by taking Jamaica away from an insular state of mind. He has pulled the people forward in their awareness of international issues.

Charistmatic style is therefore full of contradictions. It checks and balances positives and negatives. It has to be viewed dialectically. Even the speech that Michael made in Havana at the non-aligned conference in about 1979 was a very progressive one, and it was a speech that the party did not anticipate. The members had to "catch up" with his speech after he returned from Cuba. There are also many instances locally where the element of charisma was used to lead the formation of ideas and attitudes. Take the whole anti-communism issue--from the formation of the PNP, it has been accused of being communist and there has always been a suspicion within the ranks of the party. The question was never really confronted. People tended to shy away from any real discussions of ideology. I can remember when the PNP Women's Movement allied with the Committee of Women for Progress (Marxist-Leninist) in 1979-80 to deal with issues like maternity leave (issues related to the lives of women). Many PNP supporters were against this alliance, but Michael Manley single-handedly created a climate within the party (a climate which might not be there now) in which it became very difficult for anyone to openly make an anti-communist statement.

This serves to emphasize my point that at certain times a charismatic leader can take you forward on an issue, but at another time, you can remain at a standstill on the same issue or even move backward on it.

SIMMS: In discussing Manley's manipulation of individuals and symbols, how would you analyze the symbolism of his mother? She seems to be very important, both in his public and private life. How important is she to his image?

FAMILY MEMBER A: She has been described as the Mother of the Nation because of her whole involvement with Norman Manley. Although she was not explicitly political, she was always very much by his side. This was certainly true in the 1938 disturbance and at other crucial times. There is no doubt that he is a dominant force in Michael's life. His father was too, but I think that the mother more so, and I think that as long as she is alive she is going to continue to be that dominant force. There is no doubt that he goes to her constantly when he faces crisis, and that the whole mother image is very important to him. As a matter of fact, now that you use the terms, image and symbols, I think that these play a very large part in his life. Even with his wife and children, the whole issue of appearances arise. You must give an appearance--put forward a certain image. He therefore has the tendency to go more towards the symbolic rather than the substantive.

SIMMS: Did his mother's involvement in the Arts and the Jamaican Culture help to de-whiten her and legitimize her mothering of the nation?

FAMILY MEMBER A: There is no doubt about it. Her whole role, because she is considered the leader of the Art and Cultural movement in the thirties, while her husband was a leader of the political movement.

SIMMS: Was her colour not an issue then?

FAMILY MEMBER A: It was not an issue, particularly because she was carving the kinds of works that were very black. Her images had very African features and this created quite a stir in a society where, although the majority of us are black, we like to look at blue eyes and fair hair, etc. She was portraying the exact opposite, and she also related in such a way that there is hardly any Jamaican artist who has not been helped at some stage by Edna Manley. She worked at the School of Art and got involved with poor black folks--not just the sculptors and painters, but poets and artists of whatever kind. They could all gather on her verandah at what was then Drumblair. She therefore became a part of the people through the cultural movement and also because of her link with Norman Manley in the political movement. I would say that she could be considered one of the really powerful women in this country, and even though she has retired from all such people involvement while she continues to do her art, I would say she is still a force and a powerful person in her own rights, and although she is not the kind of person who pushes her point of view on Michael, she is still significant. She does not come to him, he goes to her--there is no doubt about that. This is something that needs the deepest exploration --the relationship between him and his mother, and I don't know to what extent it is true of other charismatic leaders--this relationship between them and some woman. In Michael's case, it is the "mother influence". (If she heard me she would not believe any of this.)

SIMMS: He also acknowledges her influence on him when I interviewed him.

FAMILY MEMBER A: Oh! Did he? He doesn't usually discuss this.

SIMMS: Do you have any insight of why his mother was so much more significant in his development than, say, his father?

FAMILY MEMBER A: I think he was more in awe of his father. Let me put it that way. This implies a sort of distancing. He was also in awe of his mother, but for whatever reason, she played a dominant role.

SIMMS: Michael Manley has been able to attract a number of women to him. In his private life he has had several wives and no doubt a significant number of lovers. What role do these women play? Is their role different from that of his mother?

FAMILY MEMBER A: There is no doubt that he has this large need to be surrounded by women who adore him. I don't know to what extent some of what he is reaching for is to do with the whole relationship with his mother. There is no doubt that there is an inextricable link, however his mother cannot fulfill all his needs, so these find this fulfillment through other women. Throughout his life he has had a number of women with whom he has been intimately involved in one way or another, and, in or out of power, he is always surrounded by these almost fawning women. He has a deep need, and this is not something that he talks about or even likes to accept, to have several women around him. He has to be involved with more than one woman. Of course, he always has a key woman, but in addition to her there are others. The key woman is special though, and he is protective of this relationship--nothing that he does is ever intended to touch that. Now, the women around him must not be seen in terms of sexual relationship. There are many of them who are working and serving him in whatever way they can. This is very contradictory because he is a man who maintains that he is a supporter of feminism. However, like many men, he is for women's independence as long as this falls within his perspective.

This is a particularly difficult realization for me, because for years I felt that he really believed in what he said. There was a time when I would have described him as the leader of the Women's Movement in Jamaica. He was most supportive on any legislation that affected women generally, but I think in his personal life he likes an "independent woman who is his woman"--if you can understand what I mean.

To sum up, there is no doubt that there is the need for a large grouping of a certain kind of woman--the petit bourgeois woman. This is another issue--these are the ones that get close. The working class women do not get close. It is the petit bourgeois woman and the petit bourgeois man who are close socially. Michael has this need to belong to his class and, although this class gives him such a difficult time and will never fully accept him again, he still will not give up on them.

When I first met him, there were about ten people (5 couples) who surrounded him, and all the wives adored him. I never understood this. My background did not provide for this understanding. This situation remained throughout our marriage, except at the times when I rebelled against it and literally put a stop to it. It got to the stage where I asked myself, "Why am I fighting? I must realize that that is how he is." So even though the group is much smaller than ten now, there are still about six that he could see every night, he could spend every weekend with them, and still never gets tired of them. They are his security blanket. They are all of his own class, background, etc. They are not necessarily of his ideological outlook at all, but he is nevertheless very happy with them from a class point of view.

SIMMS: Is this merely for security?

FAMILY MEMBER A: I think so, because I can remember that when I almost left him in 1975, one of the Left wing persons within the party, in encouraging me to stay, told me that I just had to accept the fact that he needed these women (these wives) around him. That is another interesting thing. They are not just women, they are wives and husbands. So I just had to try and deal with this.

SIMMS: Do you think that his marriage to you has enhanced his political career? I am asking this because you are the first "obviously black" woman that he married.

FAMILY MEMBER A: Not only married, I think I was the first that he even dated seriously. However, let me put it this way--I am still not at the stage where I am willing to say that he married me for political reasons. There are some people who believe that, but I don't know. I may reach that point of view one day, but, looking back, as far as I am concerned, we fell in love and got engaged a year before the elections, and decided that after the elections we would get married. After the elections there were many ups and downs--with me changing my mind sometimes, but largely because of him changing his mind. He was terrified of going into another marriage, etc. In the end, we got married.

From the point of view that I was black and the average Jamaican woman could look on and say, "That is my daughter" or "My daughter looks just like her", I can say that there is no doubt that I blackened his image considerably. Also, in the same way, members of the upper petit bourgeoisie disliked the marriage and did everything to stop it. This is something I found out at a later date. I found out that meetings were held to discourage him from marrying this girl. After all, "Who is she?"

So in the same way that his class hated the thought of the marriage, the majority of the working class people loved it. So I think to that extent, from a political point of view, the union was very good for him. Additionally, to the extent that I also developed with a working class outlook and I was involved in work for poor people enhanced my role. The people therefore began to see us as two sides of the same coin--very much a team, and throughout his political heydays he would probably have been incomplete without me--politically. This is because I assisted him in understanding the implications for the working class of whatever major decisions were being taken. For instance, I know what it is when the bus fares are raised. I know what happened to my mother's household when the fares went up. He doesn't. (He might think that he knows.) I know that it meant a complete shift in our household if the bus fares went up and four of us had to take the bus. It meant we could no longer buy two chickens; we would have to buy one. Because of the way I grew up, I could discuss in an objective way why alternatives to the rise in cost of bus fares had to be found.

I therefore played not only the woman's role, but I also was an advocate for the working class woman. To that extent I would say that the marriage was enhanced.

SIMMS: In spite of all this, neither you nor Mr. Manley see the marriage as a political one.

FAMILY MEMBER A: Neither of us has seen it as such. Objectively, I suppose it can be seen in that light, and there are people who see it in that way. Certainly in the beginning, neither of us saw it that way, and we still do not see it in those terms.

SIMMS: You are, however, convinced that there was a class resistance to the idea of him marrying you?

FAMILY MEMBER A: Yes, there was resistance from the browns. They were upset. I am sure they would have been happier if he had married a

Matalon or a Henriques. And of course, they were correct because such an alliance would have served their interest.

SIMMS: What kind of image did you attempt to project to the majority of Jamaican women?

FAMILY MEMBER A: I can remember the shock waves that went through the society when I decided to wear my hair in an Afro or when I went to an official function dressed in pants. Of course, first lady just never did those things before. I can also remember that when we first got into office you could count the number of women who wore Afros. After I started wearing my hair in that style, in the space of a year the Afro became the dominant hair style. Along with this came a change in the style of dressing. The African theme, the roots look, surfaced. It was almost as if the African part of our culture was coming into its own because the people had a symbol.

I also opened up the grounds of Jamaica House and established a daycare centre, a basic school, a playing field--all catering to giving poor black folks access to the grounds. These persons could now come into those grounds and feel that they are a part of it. Prior to my coming, there were tours of the house. I stopped this because I do not think we have had that long a history of Jamaica House for tours to be significant. I thought it would make for more meaningful involvement if people could come in and play a game. So that is what we did with the grounds. We attempted to use that 64 acres or more so that people could enjoy the facilities. We even created a vegetable garden so that people could be encouraged to plant. Of course, one set of people were very happy, and the others were not too happy, but then the saying goes, "some have to be happy and some have to be sad".

SIMMS: Will you continue to project that kind of image to Jamaican women?

FAMILY MEMBER A: I would be very happy if I could continue to do so, but it is very hard for me to say whether it will. I think that after working for nearly fifteen years, I don't think what I have tried to do can be erased overnight because, in fact, I think that no matter how the future is or what happens in the future--whether I stay in the marriage or come out of the marriage (the way it looks now is that I am going to be out of it, because I am just not interested in the partisan politics anymore); through my teaching career and lifestyle, I will probably find some other channel to put my energies in. If we could even get to the stage of a Women's Studies Department at the University of the West Indies, I would definitely have a role to play there. I think also that through my involvement in broadcasting I can focus on nation building through our culture and history. That is the kind of thing that interests me now--not PNP/JLP, but how people can really lift themselves up--using our culture and our history which is so complex and so rich. This is what I am hoping that I will be able to do on radio.

FAMILY MEMBER B

FAMILY MEMBER B: Michael has a combination (this is not original, but it is a fact) of some of the characteristics of Bustamante, and some of the characteristics of his father. He had, and still has, an unparalleled verbal gift and verbal facility. I think he is one of the best speakers on the American continent.

Very often, when you talk of charismatic leader, you talk of someone who is very eloquent but someone who is also somewhat authoritarian. Maybe it was a fault, in this particular situation, but Michael Manley is not an authoritarian type personality. In fact, he is very democratic, therefore everything is discussed at great length. He has shown an awareness of the importance of party structure which charismatic people often ignore while they depend on the force of their personality. Bustamante, for example, ran the Jamaican Labour Party for years and I don't think it had a constitution. He ran it as his personal fiat. This is the sort of classic authoritarian charismatic type of person.

Michael, on the other hand, spends a great deal of time on the party organization as such. He had to because of all the tensions. Whereas another type of leader would have ignored or overruled his detractors by sheer force of the personality, Michael spent a lot of time dealing with institutional factors. He developed a lot of institutions and strenghened others, such as the Regional Executive Council, (a more regional political council). The latter was one of his innovations. He also set up a situation to correct one of the inherent divisions in our system of government, the division between the political parties and the government--the Cabinet in particular. Both tended to drift apart. Manley created the situation whereby the party

Executive, or certain members of the Executive, would participate from time to time in the Cabinet meetings and special sessions, so that the party could have its input.

Manley, surprisingly for a person who is such a great speaker, was amazingly indifferent to Parliament. He hardly ever went to Parliament, he went only for the big occasions. Old Bustamante and my father, for example, were Parliamentarians. They paid a lot of attention to Parliament. Michael hardly ever went to Parliament; he was good in the field, an excellent speaker, a very democratic type of leader (some people say too democratic. One of the criticisms of him that has been made is that he should have been harder with a lot of the factions, rather than spending so much time negotiating on issues. He was not interested in Parliament. He ran the government from Cabinet and from his office but not from Parliament. Some major decisions were hardly debated in Parliament at all. One instance of his was the decision to break relations with the IMF. That decision came out of a National Executive Council meeting. It was a party decision. So you can see him more as a party person than as a government bureaucratic type of person.

SIMMS: How did he come to his ideas on democracy? Was it through his training, or was he raised in a democratic family?

FAMILY MEMBER B: The family environment was relatively democratic though my old man was definitely not. He was a man of the nineteenth century--a nineteenth century gentleman (which has its virtues and its weaknesses). Michael went to boarding school at Jamaica College, which had a very democratic atmosphere, and he went to the London School of

Economics which I think reinforced this. Then he worked for a long time in the trade union and I think a lot of his approaches were skills that he had developed in the development of the union movement--The National Workers' Union--where he was field organizer. He was also a journalist, but that was not for very long.

SIMMS: Did you, as the older brother, see yourself as very different from him as you grew up?

FAMILY MEMBER B: Well, we have had a very different sort of upbringing in that I went off to a rural boarding school and was hardly ever here at home. I was what you might call "the problem child" so I was sent off to Munro College.

SIMMS: Was he therefore more involved with his parents?

FAMILY MEMBER B: Yes, he went to Jamaica College so he was at home all the time.

SIMMS: How did his privileged background contribute to his reputation as a leader of the working class?

FAMILY MEMBER B: Because of the snobbery of the working class people. I don't know if anybody has ever told you this. Look at the great Jamaican leaders. In recent years there has only been one outstanding working class leader and that is Marcus Garvey. He was outstanding. Bustamante was a fair skinned, middle class man even though he was not wealthy. (None of us was wealthy. My grandfather was a small shopkeeper in Porus and our property was small.) Nevertheless, Bustamante's great opponent when he moved into the union field was a black working class man--Father Coombs, a man who was there before, a man who laid the foundation for the union movement. Who did the masses follow? They followed Bustamante. What does that tell you about the masses? It must say something. They had a choice: a man who had grown up to be a policeman, and a soldier, was definitely the sort of person with upper working class antecedents. He had a union. In fact, Bustamante, for a short time, worked in the union with Coombs and then he broke away and formed his own union. The masses followed Bustamante and they left Coombs.

So to answer your question, the fact that one represents the upper class does not prevent one from exercising leadership, and the fact that one is fair skinned does not prevent one from exercising leadership. Race is used ruthlessley in every election, the colours of the candidates is gone into in greatest detail. They even described me as the "white head man from England". It makes absolutely no difference provided you are willing to play the appropriate role. This is something that I haven't made up my mind about fully, it is something that I am studying. I would like to understand if the appropriate role for a black working class candidate is slightly different from that which is expected of a white upper class candidate. Both might be expected to behave in slightly different ways. I am really not sure, but if you look at Parliament, people of all colours win elections but who runs the show? There is no doubt about this--it is the brown middle class. This is one of the face cards. Everything is done in the name of the masses but the masses never do it. This may sound harsh and unfair, but how many genuine working class persons are leading? I mean there are lots of black people in Parliament. Many of these have degrees, some of them are doctors and lawyers. We have a black middle and upper class existing now, but it is these that run things in the name of the workers, and it is only recently that we have had a certain amount of working class leadership in the trade unions. Those also have been dominated by middle class people.

SIMMS: Has Michael Manley gone beyond this?

FAMILY MEMBER B: He was aware of this and he tried to break it down--I would say that for him. His ideas, exemplified by labour day when everyone went out to do work in the fields are examples of what were supposed to be symbolic acts to deter the sort of elitism of the society. However, these ideas were not shared by others and he was criticized for many of these.

SIMMS: Who was the dominant one as both of you grew up?

FAMILY MEMBER B: Well, I wasn't around much, but he had and still has a very combative and possibly a rash personality. He used to have a saying that "if you wait for the perfect plan for your affairs you will probably never get out of bed, therefore before things are perfectly planned--go out and do something". This can be carried to the extent when he ignored planning a little too much and if he has a weakness, this would be it.

One of the weaknesses of the party when he took power is that it did not have a plan. There wasn't any. There was just a series of good intentions so we had to work up a sort of plan. This was supposed to be a socialist party! You had to be working up a plan while you were deciding how to run the government. This was difficult. I think they have learned that lesson, and I understand that there is now a group at party headquarters that is developing an economic philosophy and plan. I think the lesson has been learned! I can't say how far they have got. I was associated with the process, but I have been back in Jamaica for only a month now, and I haven't really got deeply into what is happening in the party as yet.

SIMMS: In your opinion, was Michael Manley uncomfortable with the image of "Joshua, the one who would lead the masses to the Promised Land"?

FAMILY MEMBER B: I don't think he was uncomfortable with Joshua. Michael is more a big crowd man than a one-on-one man. He is at his best with fifty thousand people. He is not nearly as good with ten. However, there is a paradox because he was a very good trade union negotiator. In this he had to sit down across the table and negotiate with a small select group--so there is an apparent paradox in my analysis. One thing I can say for sure is that he was impatient with the planning process. So there were paradoxical things there: being a good union organizer and a good negotiator and at the same time not being interested in Parliament and not being interested in the planning process and the bureaucracy.

SIMMS: Would you say that Manley manipulates the image of his mother for political gains, especially at mass meetings?

FAMILY MEMBER B: The relationship between them is close. Also, one must not forget that even now she has a certain political persona of her own--the wife of the Founder of the Nation and all that. There is a genuinely close relationship between Michael and his mother. However, the use of her as a symbol at some public meetings is quite conscious, it is good public relations. It is quite conscious, and I don't see anything wrong with that. It is politics. For instance, as long as the late Alexander Bustamante was physically capable, the same thing was done with him in the promotion of the JLP ideals. Even today, in spite of her age, Lady Bustamante is seen in political terms. Such persons represent something that the society respects and holds dear. They are very powerful figures. Don't forget--this is a society that is basically very authoritarian and needs charismatic figures to solve all their problems. This is not a feature of only Third World countries. Many other societies have this characteristic. People are helpless. They think if they are not educated, then they can't help in the solving of their problems.

Here in Jamaica, personal relationships are very intimate. Even on a property which is a very authoritarian institution people rely on authority figures in an almost feudal relationship. In some of the remote rural areas, you will notice that people will call their employers by their first names. For instance, they'll address you as Mass Charlie or Doctor rather than as Mr. Brown or Dr. Brown. This is an example of how these intimate personal relationships are expressed.

This is very important.

SIMMS: Some of Mr. Manley's opponents criticise him as being unstable and use his many marriages as an example of this instability.

FAMILY MEMBER B: Not many children of politicians can maintain the family traditions of their parents. It is not easy to grow up as the child of a politician. It is rough.

SIMMS: If it was difficult for him to be the son of such outstanding parents, was it also difficult for you to be the brother of such a charismatic personality?

FAMILY MEMBER B: No, I haven't found that to be a serious problem because I am regarded as the sort of mirror image. I am the one that's supposed to be quiet and the one that's supposed to be thoughtful.

SIMMS: Are you?

FAMILY MEMBER B: Yes.

SIMMS: Have you become a different person?

FAMILY MEMBER B: Yes, but I work quite effectively in political organizations. It's just that I have a different style. I am not good with enormous crowds. They terrify me. I am very good with small groups.

SIMMS: How has Michael Manley moved beyond your father's contributions?

FAMILY MEMBER B: Democratic Socialism in the PNP is not an invention of Michael Manley. My father expressed that basic philosophy. Under my father, the ideas were not developed into a very coherent set of politics. I think one of the reasons for this was the fear of the conflict between the socialists and the non-socialists. I am talking off the top of my head now, but I think I am right.

APPENDIX 11

SONGS AND HYMNS
OF THE
PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY

Songs

1

Jamaica Arise

(Words by William Sievright. Music by Granville Campbell)

The trumpet has sounded my countrymen all,
So awake from your slumber and answer the call
The torch has been lighted, the dawn is at hand,
Who joins in the fight for his own native land?

Chorus:

Land of my birth I pledge to be
Loyal and faithful, true to thee.

Oh the toil may be heavy and the campaign long
The road will be dreary, the barriers strong
Our progress may falter and energies wane,
But steadfast in spirit our goal we will gain.

Cho: Land of my birth, etc.

In steadfast assurance that God will look down
And give us His blessings our efforts to crown
Let us all be united to build by His grace
A nobler Jamaica, a loftier race!

Cho: Land of my birth, etc.

——:o:——

2

Our Homeland

Land of our birth we adore thee
And answer when'er you call
We stand as faithful children
All for each and each for all
With hearts and hands we endeavour
Bravely to stand for thee,
We seek the welfare of our homeland
We live or die for thee.

Small is our island Jamaica
But large is the nation's heart,
And in the world of tomorrow
We may play a noble part
Well may the child go before them
Pointing the upward way.
Sons of Jamaica march with courage
Onward from day to day

Races of men make the nation
And nations are made for them,
Black, white or brown be the colour
They are nothing less than men.
Not race or wealth but character
This is our lofty thought
Let's use the wealth of our dear homeland
That lasting things be wrought.

Hail to Jamaica our home land
Fair isle of the Carib Sea
That friends abroad may engender
The highest thought of thee
We thy children must ever
Strive for the best that be
And lift the beacon higher and higher
So that the world may see.

——:o:——

3

Land Of The Bold And Free

(By W. A. McBean)

Hip-hip-hurrah for Old Jamaica,
Land of sunshine and climate serene.
Thy charms are renowned throughout the world.
And thy flag on thy hills will soon be unfurled.

Chorus:

Majestic as thy hills and mountains
Are the souls of thy faithful children,
For the good of our island home we toil,
And ne'er will we spurn our native soil.

Chorus:

The right to self determination
Is a right we will never waive
Our manhood demands that we should rise
And unitedly claim our noble prize—

Chorus:

The right to rule our country
This Pearl of the Carib Sea
The right to make our dear Old Jamaica
A land of the Bold and Free.

Chorus:

——:o:——

4

Workers' Song

(By W. A. McBean)

Workers of Jamaica, lift your voices strong today
O workers of Jamaica, let united voices say
The time has come when we must decide

To shout our rightful claims far and wide
O, workers of Jamaica
Unite, Unite and Fight.

Workers, help your comrades in this fight for liberty
Come join hands with your comrades in real fraternity
No prison cell can ever defeat
The workers who will never retreat
O, Workers of Jamaica
Unite, Unite and Fight.

Workers, all are striving in Jamaica and abroad
To end this vile oppression and this policy of fraud
For Freedom, Peace and Justice we fight
We'll win, their might can never be right
O, Workers of Jamaica
Unite, Unite and Fight.

Workers of Jamaica, heed the call to purity
O, Workers of Jamaica there's strength in unity
Let's break the bonds of thraldom away
And march towards a brighter day.
O, Workers of Jamaica
Unite, Unite and Fight.

(In event of celebrations for the release of imprisoned comrades the first verse will be:—)

Workers of Jamaica, lift your voices strong and sing
O, Workers of Jamaica let united voices ring.
Let's welcome back with joy to the fold
Our valiant comrades faithful and bold
O, Workers of Jamaica
Unite, Unite and Fight.

——:o:——

5

Ho, My Comrades

Ho, my Comrades! see the signal
Waving in the sky
Reinforcements now appearing.
Victory is nigh

Chorus:

"Hold the fort for we are coming"
PNP is strong (repeat)
Side by side we battle onward
For the Victory Won.

See the mighty host advancing
"Chief" is on the run,
Once mighty men around us falling
Courage almost gone!

See the glorious banner waving
Hear the trumpet blow!
In our Leader's name we triumph
Over every foe.

Fierce and long the battle rages;
But our help is near,
Onward comes our great commander,
Cheer my comrades, cheer!

——:o:——

6

A Better Deal

Ye sons of Jamaica arise! arise!
Let the spirit of progress be your guide
Tear the veil of illusion from our eyes
Shout your claim to your country far and wide
Let Jamaica be proud of her sons today
Let's remove all the obstacles from our way
Through the People's National Party
We will fight for a better deal.

Chorus:

A Better Deal, a Better Deal
We firmly demand a Better Deal
Through the People's National Party
We will fight for a Better Deal.

We're striving to win in this arduous fight
And we pledge ourselves to unity
We're seeking to gain our human right
To freedom and security
No longer in thraldom shall we rest
Our manhood today will stand the test
Through the People's National Party,
We will fight for a better deal.

Chorus:

A Better Deal, etc.

——:o:——

7

The Banner Of The P.N.P.

(Words and Music by Granville Campbell)

Jamaicans, Jamaicans one and all
List to the clarion call
The call that bids you 'Come and be
A member of the PNP'

Chorus:

Come rally to the PNP
The Banner meant for you and me
The hope for all our ills you see
Is the Banner of the PNP.
So, rally to the PNP
The Banner meant for you and me
The hope for all our ills you see
Is the Banner of the PNP.

Hymns

1

Thy Kingdom Come O God

Thy Kingdom Come O God
Thy rule O Christ begin
Break with Thine iron rod
The tyrannies of sin.

Where is Thy reign of peace
And purity and love
When shall all hatred cease
As in Thy realms above?

When comes the promised time
That war shall be no more
Oppression, lust and crime
Shall flee Thy face before?

We pray Thee Lord arise
And come in Thy great might
Revive our longing eyes
Which languish for Thy sight.

Men scorn Thy sacred name
And wolves devour Thy fold
By many deeds of shame
We learn that love grows cold.

O'er heathen lands afar
Thick darkness broodeth yet
Arise O morning star
Arise and never set.

2

Abide With Me

Abide with me fast falls the eventide
The darkness deepens; Lord with me abide
When other helpers fail, and comforts flee
Help of the helpless, O abide with me.

Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day
Earth's joy grows dim, its glories pass away
Change and decay in all around I see
O Thou who changeth not, abide with me.

I need Thy presence every passing hour
What but Thy grace can foil the tempter's power?
Who like Thyself my guide and stay can be?
Through cloud and sunshine, O abide with me.

I fear no foe with Thee at hand to bless
Ills have no weight and tears no bitterness.
Where is death's sting, where grave thy victory?
I triumph still, if Thou abide with me.

3

Fight The Good Fight

Fight the good fight with all thy might
Christ is thy strength and Christ thy right
Lay hold on life and it shall be
Thy joy and crown eternally.

Run the straight race
Through God's good grace
Lift up thine eyes and seek His face
Life with its ways before us lies
Christ is the Path and Christ the Prize.

Cast care aside upon thy Guide
Lean and his mercy will provide
Lean and the trusting soul shall prove
Christ is its life and Christ its love.

Faint not, nor fear, His arms are near
He changeth not and thou art dear
Only believe and thou shall see
That Christ is all in all to thee.

4

O God Our Help In Ages Past

O God, our help in ages past
Our hope for years to come
Our shelter from the stormy blast
And our eternal home.

Under the shadow of Thy Throne
Thy saints have dwelt secure
Sufficient is Thine arm alone
And our defence is sure.

Before the hills in order stood
Or earth received her frame
From everlasting Thou art God
To endless years the same

A thousand ages in Thy sight
Are like an evening gone
Short as the watch that ends the night
Before the rising sun.

Time like an ever rolling stream
Bears all its sons away
They fly forgotten as a dream
Dies at the opening day.

O God our help in ages past
Our hope for years to come
Be thou our Guide while troubles last
And our eternal home.

5

Now Thank We All Our God

Now thank we all our God
With hearts and hands and voices;
Who wondrous things hath done
In whom His word rejoices

Who from our mother's arms
Hath blessed us on our way
With countless gifts of love
And still is ours today.

O may this bounteous God
Through all our life be near us;
With ever thankful hearts,
And blessed peace to cheer us.

And keep us in His grace
And guide us when perplexed,
And free us from all ills
In this world and the next

All praise and thanks to God
The Father now be given;
The Son and Him who reigns
With them in highest heaven;

The one eternal God.
Whom earth and heaven adore;
For thus it was, is now:
And shall be evermore.

6

Let God Arise

Let God arise and lead forth those
Who march to war!
Let God arise, and all His foes
Be scattered far!

So Israel prayed, and Thou, O Lord,
Wast with them then:
Be with us now who draw the sword
For war again.

Grant Thou our soldiers courage high
When foes, are near.
To strive, to suffer or to die
Untouched by fear.

Grant strength to those, who mourn today
Their loved ones lost.
Yea those who gave their best, nor stay
To count the cost.

Yet more and more, as ages run,
Bid warfare cease.
And give to all beneath the sun
Love, Freedom, Peace.

7

Shine On Eternal Light

Shine on eternal light
To greet our souls this day
Dispel the gloominess of night
And drive our doubts away

Our longing eyes prepare
When wars and strifes shall cease
To view the morn soon to appear
The new era of peace.

Come Lord and give new birth
To man's destructive mind
Spread where confusion reigns on earth
Goodwill to all mankind

Shine on eternal light
Thy penetrating ray
Shall turn the hours of darkness night
Into eternal day.

8

To Be A Pilgrim

Who would true valour see
Let him come hither;
One here will constant be
Come wind, come weather
There's no discouragement
Shall make him once relent
His first avowed intent
To be a Pilgrim.

Who so beset him round
With dismal stories
Do but themselves confound
His strength the more is,
No foes shall stay his might
Though he with giants fight—
He will defend his right
To be a Pilgrim.

Since Lord Thou dost defend
Us with Thy spirit,
We know we at the end
Shall life inherit.
Then fancies flee away
I'll fear not what men say—
I'll labour night and day
To be a Pilgrim.

APPENDIX 111

A PHOTOGRAPHIC ACCOUNT

The pictures in this
Appendix have been
used through the
courtesy of the National
Library of Jamaica
and the People's National
Party Headquarters

A FAMILY DYNASTY

TO THE LIGHT

WITH THE CROWDS

JOSHUA

THE INTERNATIONAL APPEAL